

RECONSTRUCTING THE HAGIOGRAPHICAL OEUVRE  
OF MICHAEL, MONK OF STOUDIOS,  
ARCHIMANDRITE OF DALMATOS  
AND PATRIARCHAL SYNKELLOS (9th/10th CENTURIES)

DIRK KRAUSMÜLLER

This article seeks to ascertain whether twelve hagiographical texts can be attributed to a single author: *Vita B* of Theodore of Stoudios (*BHG* 1754), the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra (*BHG* 1348), the *Passio* of Callistus, one of the Forty-Two Martyrs (*BHG* 1213), and the *encomia* of Isaac and Dalmatus (*BHG* 956d), of Eustratius (*BHG* 646b), of Zacharias (*BHG* 1881n), of Philip (*BHG* 1530a/1531), of Daniel (*BHG* 488), of Patriarch Ignatius (*BHG* 818), of Mary's girdle (*BHG* 1146m), and of Michael and Gabriel (*BHG* 1294a), which in the manuscripts are ascribed to a monk or archimandrite or *synkellos* named Michael, and in addition also the *Life* of Nicholas of Stoudios (*BHG* 1365), and the *Life* of Blaise of Amorium (*BHG* 278), which are anonymous but display similar stylistic features.<sup>1</sup>

One of the confessors of icon worship during the Second Iconoclasm was the Palestinian monk Michael. Prior to his arrival in Constantinople in 814 he had been *synkellos* of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and after the Triumph of Orthodoxy he became abbot of the suburban monastery of Chora and *synkellos* of Patriarch

---

This article is part of the project “Reassessing Ninth Century Philosophy. A Synchronic Approach to the Logical Traditions” (9 SALT) that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 648298).

- 1 Two texts will not be considered as they contain no clues that would allow identification of the author: 1) an *encomium* of Mocius (*BHG* 1298h), edited in H. DELEHAYE, *Saints de Thrace et de Mésie*. *AnBoll* 31 (1912) 176-187; 2) an unedited *encomium* of the Angels (*BHG* 129a), which in the lemma is attributed to two authors, John Mauropus and the *synkellos* of Patriarch Methodius: Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ μακαριωτάτου μητροπολίτου Εὐχαϊτῶν, Μιχαὴλ τοῦ συγγέλου καὶ ὁμολογητοῦ λόγος, cf. Codex Athous Dionysiou 231, fol. 210v. In addition we know of an *encomium* of the Presentation, which was found in a now lost manuscript and is only known to us from a *pinax*, see A. EHRHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts, I: Die Überlieferung, 1 (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 50)*. Leipzig 1937, 484-488.

Methodius, two positions that he held until his death in 846.<sup>2</sup> Scholars have long known that in Byzantine manuscripts several hagiographical texts are attributed to ‘Michael the Synkellos.’ This has raised the question whether they are works of the same author. In 1901 Siméon Vailhé listed in an article five *encomia*, dedicated to Dionysius the Areopagite, the Baptist’s father Zacharias, the archangels Michael and Gabriel, the patriarch Ignatius, and Mary’s girdle. He pointed out that at least the fourth text could not have been written by Methodius’ *synkellos* since Ignatius died only in 877, and further suggested that the last text may also have been written by a later author.<sup>3</sup> The discussion was resumed half a century later when Raymond Loenertz set out to prove that the *encomium* of Dionysius the Areopagite was indeed a genuine work of Methodius’ *synkellos*. In an appendix he mentioned five more texts, the *encomia* of Zacharias, Ignatius, Michael and Gabriel, and Mary’s girdle, which are attributed to Michael the Synkellos, and in addition also the *encomia* of Mocius and of Isaac and Dalmatus, which are attributed to Michael the Monk, before concluding: ‘En comparant ces données, on se convaincra aisément que nous sommes en présence d’un seul et même auteur, bien distinct de son homonyme, S. Michel, prêtre et syncelle de Jerusalem.’<sup>4</sup> In 1959 Hans-Georg Beck listed all the texts that the manuscripts attribute to Michael the Synkellos or Michael the Monk, including the *Passio* of Callistus, which had not been mentioned by the earlier authors, and then suggested that the lemmata must refer to two different authors. Confusingly, he then added that there might have been a third Michael, a Stoudite monk, who would have written *Vita B* of Theodore of Stoudios and the *Encomium* of Ignatius, and as well as, according to Albert Ehrhard, also the *encomia* of Eustratius, Daniel, Philip, and Isaac and Dalmatus.<sup>5</sup> In 1980 Daniel Stiernon produced another list, this time limited to texts that are ascribed to Michael the Synkellos.<sup>6</sup> He mentioned Loenertz’ conclusion but pointed out that without a detailed stylistic comparison of all the works all attributions would remain guesswork. In 1996 Tatiana Mantseva published a critical edition of the *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel. In her introduction she suggested that *Vita B* of Theodore of Stoudios was written

2 See M.B. CUNNINGHAM, *The Life of Michael the Synkellos. Text, Translation, and Commentary (Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 1)*. Belfast 1991.

3 S. VAILHÉ, *Saint Michel le Syncelle et les deux frères Grapti, saint Théodore et saint Théophane (fin)*. ROC 6 (1901) 611-642, esp. 638-640.

4 R. LOENERTZ, *Le panégyrique de S. Denys l’Aréopagite par Michel le Syncelle*. *AnBoll* 68 (1950) 94-107, esp. 103.

5 H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich (Byzantinisches Handbuch, 2.1)*. München 1959, 503-504.

6 D. STIERNON, *Michel le Syncelle (saint), hagiographe byzantin, † 846*. DS 10 (1980) 1193-1197.

by the same author. In a footnote she announced that she was preparing a study of six further texts, the *encomia* of Daniel, Eustratius, Isaac and Dalmatus, Philip, Zacharias, and Mocius, which go under the name of Michael the Monk.<sup>7</sup> Curiously enough, she did not consider texts exclusively attributed to Michael the Synkellos, even though one recension of the text that she edited went under that name.<sup>8</sup> The last substantial contribution to the discussion was an article by me. There I pointed out that the rare compound θεοπάροχος can be found in *Vita B* of Theodore of Stoudios, in a *life* of Nicholas of Myra, in the *Passio* of Callistus, and in the *encomia* of Daniel, Philip, Zacharias, Michael and Gabriel, and Isaac and Dalmatus.<sup>9</sup> The problems of attribution are reflected in the *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, which lists four Michaels: Methodius' *synkellos*, a second Michael the Synkellos, Michael the Archimandrite, and Michael the Stoudite.<sup>10</sup> The present article seeks to overcome this impasse. It combines observations made by earlier scholars with new arguments, so as to come to more definite conclusions. Where possible it identifies the *Vorlagen* of the texts and shows how they have been reworked.

7 T. MATANTSEVA, Éloge des archanges Michel et Gabriel par Michel le Moine (*BHG* 1294a). *JÖB* 46 (1996) 97-155, esp. 97 n. 2, 116, 126.

8 MATANTSEVA, Éloge des archanges (cited n. 7), 116.

9 D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Vitae B, C and A* of Theodore the Stoudite: Their Interrelation, Dates, Authors and Significance for the History of the Stoudios Monastery in the Tenth Century. *AnBoll* 131 (2013) 280-298, esp. 289-290. The compound θεοπάροχος does not appear in the writings of other contemporary authors such as Nicetas the Paphlagonian, Emperor Leo VI, Peter of Argos, Patriarch Euthymius and Anastasius the Stammerer. The following texts have been surveyed: a) the works of Nicetas the Paphlagonian edited in *PG* 105, 15-440, as well as F. HALKIN, *Le panégyrique du martyr Procope de Palestine par Nicéas le Paphlagonien*. *AnBoll* 80 (1962) 174-193, and M. BONNET, *Acta Andreae apostoli cum laudatione contexta*. *AnBoll* 13 (1894) 309-352; b) the works of Emperor Leo edited by Th. ANTONOPOULOU, *Leo VI Sapiens, Imperator Byzantinus, Homiliae* (*CCSG*, 63). Turnhout 2008; c) the works of Peter of Argos edited by K. TH. KYRIAKOPOULOS, *Ἁγίου Πέτρου ἐπισκόπου Ἄργους βίος καὶ λόγοι*. Athens 1976; d) the works of Patriarch Euthymius edited by M. JUGIE, *Homélie mariales Byzantines, I* (*PO*, 16). Paris 1922, 499-514; *Homélie mariales Byzantines, II* (*PO*, 19). Paris 1926, 441-455; e) the works of Anastasius the Stammerer edited by G. METALLENOS, *Ἀναστασίου πρωτασηκρήτις ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Αἰκατερίνην*. *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 54 (1972) 237-274, and G. VAN HOOFF, *Encomium in s. Agathonicum Nicomediensem martyrem*. *AnBoll* 5 (1886) 369-415. The word is also not found in the sermons of Photius edited by B. LAOURDAS, *Φωτίου ὁμιλία*. Thessalonike 1959. It is more frequent in earlier authors, cf. e.g. *Life of Stephen the Younger* by Stephen the Deacon, 7, ed. M.-F. AUZÉPY, *La Vie d'Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre*. Aldershot 1997, 96.17-18.

10 *PMBZ* 5059, 5089, 5121.

### Vita B of Theodore of Stoudios

*Vita B* of Theodore of Stoudios (d. 826) is the oldest surviving full-scale *life* of the saint.<sup>11</sup> In the earliest manuscript, the Codex Vaticanus graecus 1669 from the beginning of the tenth century, we read that the text had been written *παρὰ Μιχαὴλ μοναχοῦ* (by Michael the Monk).<sup>12</sup> Michael was without doubt a member of the Stoudite community.<sup>13</sup> Indeed, he indicates that he acted at the request of others in the monastery: *ταῖς ὑμετέραις πειθαρχήσαντες ἐντολαῖς πατέρων αἰδεσιμώτατοι* (having obeyed your commandments, venerable fathers).<sup>14</sup> An approximate date is suggested by a statement about the Stoudite abbot Nicholas: *μέχρις ἡμῶν τῶν ταπεινῶν ἐν τοῖς τῆς ὁμολογίας διαπρέψας ποικίλοις παθήμασιν* (who has excelled until us, the humble ones, in the various sufferings of his confession).<sup>15</sup> Here the aorist participle *διαπρέψας* indicates that Nicholas was no longer alive when the text was written. As Charles van de Vorst has already pointed out this establishes the year 868, the date of Nicholas' death, as a *terminus post quem*.<sup>16</sup> Establishing a *terminus ante quem* is a more difficult task. If the author had indeed been a contemporary of Nicholas he could have been born as late as 860 and could thus have lived for several more decades. Consequently, even the early tenth century cannot be excluded as a possible date of composition.

The text is written in rather ponderous Greek. The author has a penchant for long sentences, which can be syntactically awkward,<sup>17</sup> and he makes frequent use of epithets and similes. One passage may serve as an example.

Ἦ τὸν μέγαν τοῦτον καὶ ἀκαταγώνιστον τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως ἀριστεία, καὶ τοῦ μοναδικοῦ τάγματος διαβόητον κυβερνήτην ἐνεγκαμένην τε καὶ ἐκθρέψασα Θεόδωρον, ἡ τῶν πανταχοῦ γῆς πόλεων προκαθημένη πέφυκε πόλις, καθ' ἣν ἐκράτει τῆς ἀρχῆς τηλικάδε, ὁ ἐξ ἀσεβοῦς ἀσεβέστερος ἐκραγεῖς γόνος, Κωνσταντίνος ὁ Κοπρώνυμος, καὶ τῆς Χριστομανικῆς αἰρέσεως δευτερωτῆς ἀναφανεῖς γενικώτατος, ἐκθλίβων τὸν νέον Χριστοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καθάπερ ποτὲ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος νοῦς Φαραῶ τῷ πληλῶ καὶ τῇ πλινθείᾳ τῆς εἰκονομαχικῆς πυργοποιΐας διὰ τῶν

11 See O. DELOUIS, Saint-Jean-Baptiste de Stoudios à Constantinople. La contribution d'un monastère à l'histoire de l'Empire Byzantin, I. Diss. Université Paris I-Panthéon Sorbonne 2005, 323-324.

12 Cod. Vat. gr. 1669, 199r. Edited in *PG* 99, 233-328.

13 *Vita B* of Theodore, 1, 236A.

14 *Vita B* of Theodore, 1, 236AB.

15 *Vita B* of Theodore, 40, 293A.

16 Nikolaos Studites *PMBZ* 5576/corr. See C. VAN DE VORST, La translation de S. Théodore Studite et de S. Joseph de Thessalonique. *AnBoll* 32 (1913) 27-62, esp. 29. DELOUIS, Saint-Jean-Baptiste (cited n. 11), 323, mentions 848 as *terminus post quem* but this seems to be a mistake.

17 See KRAUSMÜLLER, *Vitae B, C and A* (cited n. 9), 283-286.

πικρῶν τῆς τοιαύτης οἰκοδομίας ἐργοδιωκτῶν, καθ' ὅτι ἔβλεπεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἐπειγόμενον τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς πολιτείας καὶ ἀνυπερθέτως τοῖς δεσποτικοῖς ἐξακολουθοῦντα θεσμοθετήμασιν.<sup>18</sup>

The one that bore and raised this great und unconquerable forefighter of the orthodox faith and famous steersman of the monastic order, was the city that presides over cities everywhere on earth, where at that time the rule was in the hands of Constantine the dung-named, who had erupted from an impious one as a more impious offspring and who had appeared as a most general successor of the heresy that raged about Christ, oppressing the new Israel of Christ, as once the Egyptian mind Pharaο did, through the mud and the brick-making of the tower-making of the image-fighters through the bitter overseers of such a construction, because he saw it hurrying towards the land of the evangelical life-style and following the legislations of the Lord without delay.

This complex sentence contains not only elaborate 'double-barrelled' characterisations of Theodore and of Constantine V but also a detailed comparison of the emperor and the Iconophile faction with Pharaο and the people of Israel, leavened with several borrowings from Exodus,<sup>19</sup> and an interpretation of the name 'Pharaο' as 'mind', which goes back to Philo.<sup>20</sup> This last feature is clearly dear to Michael's heart. He repeatedly offers exegeses of personal names, which he regards as expressions of a divine plan that the bearers are called on to realise.<sup>21</sup> To give two examples: Michael tells us that Theodore's father was called Photinus and then adds: φῶς ἀληθῶς κατὰ τὴν λάλον τῶν Ἀθηναίων γλῶτταν παρὰ θεῷ γεννηθεῖς, φωτεινὸς τοῖς τρόποις καὶ τῇ κλήσει γεγένηται (having been born by God as light in the true sense according to the warbling tongue of the Athenians he was light-like in his character and in his name).<sup>22</sup> Immediately afterwards he then explains why Theodore's mother was called Theoctiste: ἅτε ὑπὸ θεοῦ κτισθεῖσα καὶ τὴν ὁμοίαν προσηγορίαν τοῖς ἔργοις σφραγισθεῖσα (because she had been founded by God and had been confirmed through deeds in a similar appellation).<sup>23</sup>

18 *Vita B* of Theodore, 2, 236BC.

19 Exodus 1:14 τῷ πηλῷ καὶ τῇ πλινθείᾳ; 5:6 τοῖς ἐργοδιώκταις.

20 See A. C. GELJON, Abraham in Egypt: Philo's Interpretation of Genesis 10:10-20, in G. E. STERLING (ed.), *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Philo in Honor of David Runia (Studies in Hellenistic Judaism, 28)*. Atlanta 2016, 297-320, esp. 316, note 65. Another characteristic feature is the use of rare words, such as δευτερωτής, which normally has the meaning of 'teacher of traditional laws' but is here used in the sense of 'successor'.

21 On this notion see D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Showing one's true colours: Patriarch Methodios on the morally improving effect of sacred images. *BMGS* 40 (2016) 298-306, esp. 304-305.

22 *Vita B* of Theodore, 2, 236C, with reference to Pseudo-Dionysius.

23 *Vita B* of Theodore, 2, 236D.

In order to be able to compose his text so many years after Theodore's death Michael had to rely on earlier sources. He may have written down oral accounts, such as the miracle stories, which were told to the Stoudites by an ancient monk who used to visit the saint's tomb on a regular basis.<sup>24</sup> Yet he certainly also made use of older texts. As was already noticed by van de Vorst,<sup>25</sup> the account of Theodore's last days is a paraphrase of a letter, the so-called *Encyclic*, by Theodore's disciple and successor as abbot of Stoudios, Naucratius.<sup>26</sup> The beginning and the end of the passage read as follows:

*Vita B* of Theodore

Ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ ἡμῶν περὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦ Νοεμβρίου μηνὸς νόσφ ληφθεὶς τῇ συντροφῇ καὶ ἄνωθεν αὐτῷ συνεισπεσοῦση ἐκ τῶν πολυθλίπτων ἐκείνων φυλακῶν τε καὶ ἐξοριῶν καὶ τῆς ἐντεῦθεν τελείας ἀνεπιμελησίας, λέγω δὴ τῆς τοῦ στομάχου...<sup>27</sup>

At the beginning of the month of November our pious father was smitten by an illness that was chronic and had been contracted by him because of those greatly wearying imprisonments and exiles and the consequent complete lack of care, I mean that of the stomach ...

... καὶ οὕτω τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀρξαμένων τῆς ψαλμωδίας τοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ φθασάντων ἐν τῷ στίχῳ τῆς δευτέρας στάσεως τῷ λέγοντι, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ μὴ ἐπιλάθωμαι τῶν δικαιοματίων σου, ὅτι ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐξήσας με, αὐτόθι διατριβόντων αὐτῶν, παρέδωκεν τὴν ἀγίαν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν.<sup>28</sup>

Naucratius, *Encyclic*

Ὡς ἐν κεφαλαίῳ δὲ ἐροῦμεν, ὡς κἀντεῦθεν τινα παραμυθίαν εὐρέσθαι ὑμᾶς. ἡ μὲν νόσος ἡ ἀρχαία, λέγω δὴ τοῦ στομάχου, ἥτις ἐκ τῶν πολυχρονίων φυλακῶν καὶ ἐξοριῶν καὶ τῆς ἐντεῦθεν τελείας ἀνεπιμελησίας αὐξηθεῖσα, ...<sup>29</sup>

But we will speak in summary fashion so that in this way, too, you will find some consolation. The illness was the old one, I mean that of the stomach, which had increased because of the lengthy imprisonments and exiles and the consequent complete lack of care ...

... κἀνταῦθα προσβάλλομεν τῇ ψαλμωδίᾳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ στίχῳ ἐν ᾧ φησιν, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ μὴ ἐπιλάθωμαι τῶν δικαιοματίων σου, ὅτι ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐξήσας με, ἐνδιατριβόντων, παρέδωκε τὴν μακαρίαν καὶ καθαρὰν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν τοῖς ἀγίοις ἀγγέλοις.<sup>30</sup>

24 *Vita B* of Theodore, 48, 305AB. It is, of course, possible that these stories already existed in written form.

25 VAN DE VORST, La translation (cited n. 16), 32-33.

26 Naucratius *PMBZ* 5230. Edition in *PG* 99, 1825-1849.

27 *Vita B* of Theodore, 64, 321D.

28 *Vita B* of Theodore, 67, 325C.

29 Naucratius, *Encyclic*, 1836AB.

30 Naucratius, *Encyclic*, 1845B.

... and thus when the brothers had begun the psalmody of the “Undeiled” and had reached the verse of the second station, which says: “I will never forget your precepts for with them you have quickened me”, and were reciting it, he gave up his holy soul.<sup>31</sup>

... and there we turned to psalmody, and when we were reciting the verse, in which it says: “I will never forget your precepts for with them you have quickened me”, he gave up his blessed and pure soul to the holy angels.

These few lines are already sufficient to show that Michael kept quite close to the wording of Naucratius’ letter. We find some changes – the phrase λέγω δὴ τοῦ στομάχου is moved to the end of the sentence, and the adjective πολυχρονίων is replaced with the similar sounding πολυθλίπτων – but they do not obscure the character of the original text. This holds true for the intervening passages as well. At most, Michael omits part of a passage, which he considers to be too long. One such case is Theodore’s farewell speech, which in his text ends with the words καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τῆς κατηχήσεως (and the rest of the catechesis).<sup>32</sup>

Naucratius’ *Encyclic* was not Michael’s only written source. At the beginning of the *Life* he mentions writings about Theodore that already existed when he embarked on his task. After a reference to hymns by Stoudite monks he continues: μεθ’ οὗς καὶ ἕτεροι τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἱερομυστῶν ἐν συγγραφῆς εἶδει καὶ ἐγκωμίων σχηματισμῶ γλαφυρῶς ἄγαν κατ’ ἐπεκτάδην συνέταξαν ὑπόμνημα εἰς γῆρας θησαυρίσαντες λήθης φάρμακον (after whom others from among the sacred initiators of the church composed a memorandum in the form of an account and in the shape of an encomium in an exceedingly refined and profuse manner, having stored it up for old age as a medicine for forgetfulness).<sup>33</sup> This ‘memorandum’ was clearly substantial text.<sup>34</sup> The juxtaposition of συγγραφή and ἐγκώμιον suggests that it was ‘historical’ in content but rhetorical in form. It will therefore have belonged to the mixed genre of *vita-encomium*, which enjoyed some popularity in ninth- and tenth-century Byzantium.<sup>35</sup> However, its main characteristic was its style, which is described with the adverb γλαφυρῶς. This

31 *Psalm* 118:93.

32 *Vita B* of Theodore, 64, 324A.

33 *Vita B* of Theodore 1, 233C.

34 Cf. John of Damascus, *Dialectica*, 8.7, ed. B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, I. Institutio elementaris, Capita philosophica (Dialectica) (PTS, 7). Berlin 1969, 69, where λόγους κατ’ ἐπεκτάδην is glossed as ἐκτεταμένους καὶ μεγάλους.

35 Cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Metaphrasis* after the Second Iconoclasm: Nicephorus Skeuophylax and his *encomia* of Theophanes Confessor (BHG 1790), Theodore of Sykeon (BHG 1749), and George the Martyr (BHG 682). *SO* 78 (2003) 45-70, esp. 60.

term, which is usually translated as ‘refined’ or ‘polished’, suggests that it was written in a high linguistic register.<sup>36</sup> This quality was one reason for the production of *Vita B*. Michael states that most members of the community did not understand it and that he was therefore told to produce λόγους πρὸς τὸ εὐληπτὸν τε καὶ καταφανῆς μεταποιουμένους (speeches that were transformed so as to be easily comprehended and clear).<sup>37</sup>

This cannot be a reference to Naucratius’ *Encyclic*, which only deals with the saint’s last days and is written in an accessible style. Indeed, as we have seen Michael incorporates it with only minor retouches. One could argue that at a later date Naucratius or another Stoudite monk wrote a full-scale *Life* of Theodore, which then served as the model for Michael’s text. This is, however, unlikely since Michael characterises the author as τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἱερομύστης. In *Vita B* the Pseudo-Dionysian term ἱερομύστης is normally used for members of the episcopate such as the Constantinopolitan patriarchs Paul and Nicephorus,<sup>38</sup> in keeping with contemporary literary convention.<sup>39</sup> Accordingly, Ernst von Dobschütz declared in his seminal article ‘Methodios und die Studiten’ of 1909 that the author was ‘ein hoher kirchlicher Würdenträger.’<sup>40</sup> Von Dobschütz also drew attention to another characteristic of *Vita B*, the complete silence about the controversy between Patriarch Methodios and the Stoudites, which was very acrimonious and resulted in the recalcitrant monks’ house arrest.<sup>41</sup> For this reason he stated: ‘Ich möchte vermuten, dass es ... auch eine Vita oder ein Enkomion Theodors gegeben hat, das von Methodios inspiriert [war].’<sup>42</sup> In a second step

36 LIDDELL & SCOTT, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. γλαφυρός, III.4. of literary style, polished, elegant.

37 *Vita B* of Theodore, 1, 236B.

38 *Vita B* of Theodore, 61, 320B4: τοῦ ἱερομύστου Νικηφόρου; 65, 324C: ἡ μνήμη τοῦ μεγάλου ἱερομύστου καὶ τῆς τριάδος ὁμολογητοῦ Παύλου; 35, 285B: τῶν λοιπῶν ἱερομυστῶν, mentioned after the patriarch. Only once the term is applied to Theodore, see *Vita B* of Theodore, 59, 316D. Naucratius is never characterised in this way, cf. *Vita B* of Theodore, 65, 324C: ὁ ἀοίδιμος Ναυκράτιος.

39 Cf. also Nicephorus Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus, *Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*, ed. J. M. FEATHERSTONE (CCSG, 33). Turnhout – Leuven 1997, 62, 103: ὁ τῆς Κυπρίων ἱερομύστης, i.e. Archbishop Epiphanius; and Patriarch Nicephorus, *Short History*, ed. C. MANGO (CFHB, 13). Washington, DC 1990, 7: ὁ ἱερομύστης καὶ οἱ ἐν τέλει, i.e. Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople.

40 E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, Methodios und die Studiten. *BZ* 16 (1909) 41-105, esp. 64.

41 See J. DARROUZÈS, Le patriarche Méthode contre les iconoclastes et les Studites. *RÉB* 45 (1987) 15-57; and K. MAKSIMOVIĆ, Patriarch Methodios I. (843-847) und das studitische Schisma. Quellenkritische Bemerkungen. *Byz* 70 (2000) 422-446.

42 VON DOBSCHÜTZ, Methodios und die Studiten (cited n. 49), 68.



he then hypothesised that Methodius asked Ignatius the Deacon to write the text. Ignatius was metropolitan of Nicaea and could therefore be referred to as ἱερομύστης although one must not forget that he lost this post because of his Iconoclast views when Methodius became patriarch.<sup>43</sup> Ignatius' style is certainly refined and polished as can be seen from the *Lives* of the Patriarchs Tarasius and Nicephorus.<sup>44</sup> Yet he is not the only candidate for authorship. The text could also have been written by Patriarch Methodius himself. Methodius is a well-known hagiographer. He composed the *Life* of Theophanes of Agros, another Iconophile confessor, which is still extant, and which is written in a very complicated and sometimes barely comprehensible Greek.<sup>45</sup> *Vita B* tells us that after the end of Iconoclasm Methodius officiated at the service that celebrated the translation of Theodore's remains to the monastery of Stoudios.<sup>46</sup> Thus it is possible that he composed his text for this occasion. This would fit well with the reference to the author's γῆρας because by that time Methodius was already an old man. Indeed, we know of the existence of a hymn that he devoted to Theodore. The eleventh-century liturgical *typikon* of Patriarch Alexius, which reflects Stoudite practice, mentions a canon under his name as part of the service for the saint's feast day on 11 November.<sup>47</sup>

### *Life* of Nicholas of Myra

Unfortunately, comparison of *Vita B* with Methodius' extant works does not yield definite results. It is possible to come to a firmer conclusion when we consider another text, a *Life* of Nicholas of Myra, which has come down to us in two recensions that do not differ greatly from one another.<sup>48</sup> The text is addressed to

43 See S. EFTHYMIADIS, *The Life of Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatius the Deacon* (BHG 1689). Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary (*Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs*, 4). Aldershot 1998, 45.

44 See S. EFTHYMIADIS, *On the Hagiographical Work of Ignatius the Deacon*. *JÖB* 41 (1991) 73-83.

45 See M. HINTERBERGER, *Wortschöpfung und literarischer Stil bei Methodios I.*, in E. TRAPP – S. SCHÖNAUER (eds.), *Lexicologica Byzantina. Beiträge zum Kolloquium zur byzantinischen Lexikographie*, Bonn, 13.-15. Juli 2007. Bonn 2008, 119-150.

46 *Vita B* of Theodore 68, 328A: μετετέθη δὲ ἐνδόξως πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ ποιμνὴν τοῦ Στουδίου ... ἐπὶ τῆς λειτουργίας Μεθοδίου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου πατριάρχου.

47 A. M. ΡΕΝΤΚΟΒΣΚΙ, *Tipikon patriarha Aleksija Studita v Bizantii i na Rusi*. Moscow 2001, 293-294: ста(г) феодора ... творение мефе(д).

48 *Life* of Nicholas of Myra, ed. G. ANRICH, *Hagios Nikolaos. Der heilige Nikolaos in der griechischen Kirche. Texte und Untersuchungen, I: Die Texte*. Leipzig – Berlin 1913, 113-139.

the layman Leo.<sup>49</sup> One recension is anonymous whereas the other has the lemma Μιχαήλ τοῦ ἀρχιμανδρίτου (by the archimandrite Michael).<sup>50</sup> As the editor Gustav Anrich noticed the text shares several phrases with *Vita B* of Theodore.<sup>51</sup> At the beginning of the *Life* of Nicholas we find the comparison: οἷά τις πολύφωτος ἀστήρ τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου, ὡσπερ χρυσαυγοῦντα νέφη τὰς τῶν οἰκειῶν ἀρετῶν προβαλλόμενος λαμπηδόνας (like some star of many lights of the sun of righteousness, emitting the splendour of his own virtues like clouds that have a golden sheen),<sup>52</sup> and at the beginning of *Vita B* of Theodore we read: ἀνατεταλκῶς οἷά τις πολύφωτος ἀστήρ, τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν μικροῦ δεῖν ταῖς ἀσκητικαῖς λάμψεσιν ... περιέβαλεν (having risen like some star of many lights he encompassed almost the whole world with his ascetical splendour).<sup>53</sup> The similarity between the two phrases is striking, in particular since they find themselves in such prominent positions. This raises the possibility that the texts were written by the same person, and that Michael the Monk is identical with Michael the Archimandrite. Unfortunately, the other parallels listed by Anrich are much less close. For this reason he concluded: ‘Einen zwingenden Schluß gestatten diese Parallelen nicht, denn es handelt sich in ihnen zum Teil um gangbare Ausdrücke’. Yet a closer look reveals the existence of other common features. The bishop of Myra is addressed as ὦ ἱερομόστα πάτερ,<sup>54</sup> and we find in both texts rare words such as θεοπάροχος,<sup>55</sup> σταδιεύειν,<sup>56</sup> and ἐννεοττεύειν, the latter appearing in the remarkably similar phrases τοὺς αὐτόθι ἐννεοττεύοντας δαίμονας (the demons that were nesting there) and τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ δῆθεν ἐννεοττεύσαντας δαίμονας (the demons that were supposedly nesting in her).<sup>57</sup>

49 *Life* of Nicholas, 2, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 114.8.

50 *Life* of Nicholas, tit., ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 114, apparatus.

51 G. ANRICH, Hagios Nikolaos. Der heilige Nikolaos in der griechischen Kirche. Texte und Untersuchungen, II: Prolegomena, Untersuchungen, Indices. Leipzig – Berlin 1917, 268-269. See also D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Patriarch Methodius, the Author of the Lost First *Life* of Theodore of Stoudios. SO 81 (2007) 144-150.

52 *Life* of Nicholas, 1, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 113.4-5.

53 *Vita B* of Theodore, 1, 233A.

54 *Life* of Nicholas, 50, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 138.9.

55 *Vita B* of Theodore, 56, 313B: καὶ ἔχομεν αὐτὸν ὡς ἓνα τῶν ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοπάροχον διδάσκαλον τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας; and *Life* of Nicholas, 2, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 114.3: τὸν θεοπάροχον καὶ κοσμικὸν συλλήπτορα; *Life* of Nicholas, 51, ed. ANRICH, *ibid.* 138.21: τὸ τῶν θλιβομένων θεοπάροχον παραμύθιον.

56 *Vita B* of Theodore, 67, 325B: τὸν δρόμον σταδιεύσας, and *Life* of Nicholas, 49, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 138.8: ζῶην ἤρεμον καὶ ἀπήμαντον σταδιεύειν καταξιούνται.

57 *Vita B* of Theodore, 43, 296D; and *Life* of Nicholas, 29, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 128.9. Other contemporary writers use the much more common equivalent ἐμφωλεύειν, cf.

This alone may not be considered sufficient proof of authorship. Yet other aspects of the text allow us to corroborate our hypothesis. In the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra the author informs us that Leo has encouraged him τὴν περὶ τοῦ μεγάλου τούτου ἀρχιερέως ἐξήγησιν σαφεστέραν ἐκθέσθαι καὶ τὰ ἄλλοις βαθέως ἄγαν καὶ ἰσχνῶς πονηθέντα εὐσύνοπτα τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι προθεῖναι (to set out more clearly the account about this great archpriest and to present in an accessible fashion to those who do not know it that which had been wrought by others in an exceedingly deep and concise fashion).<sup>58</sup> With these lines the author lets us know that he makes use of an older text, which he seeks to simplify so that it can be understood by a wider audience. This model can still be identified. As was once suggested by Ihor Ševčenko it is Patriarch Methodius' *Vita-Encomium* of Nicholas of Myra.<sup>59</sup> One example may suffice to show how similar the texts are in content and how much they differ in intelligibility.

*Life* of Nicholas by Michael

Ἐπεὶ δὲ τεχθεὶς ὁ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς θεῶν ἡγιασμένος τῷ μητρῷ μαζῷ βρεφοπρεπῶς ἀπετρέφετο, δείκνυσι κἀνταῦθα ὁ κύριος, θαυματουργῶν συνήθως ἐν τοῖς αὐτῷ προεγνωσμένοις θεράπουσιν, ὁποῖος ἔσται τὴν πολιτείαν τῷ μετὰ ταῦτα βίῳ ὁ μέγας Νικόλαος. γαλουχούμενος γὰρ τῇ μητρικῇ θηλῇ τὰς ἄλλας τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἡμέρας κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς τοῖς βρέφεσιν, τε-

*Vita-Encomium* of Nicholas  
by Methodius

Οὕτω δὲ τεχθεὶς καὶ οὕτως τῷ θεῷ οἰκονομηθεὶς δεικνύει εὐθύς ἐν αὐτῇ νηπιότητι τὰ ἀξιοπρεπῆ ὑπὲρ ἡλικίαν χαρίσματα. ὁ γὰρ ἔτι γαλουχούμενος βρεφοπρεπῶς καὶ συλλογισμοῦ ἐνεργείας μὴ εὐπορῶν ὄργανον, ὠρῶν ἀριθμούς καὶ μέτρα ἡμέρας ἐπ' εὐδοκίῳ κυρίῳ στοχάζεσθαι, τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν τετράδι καὶ ἕκτῃ κανονικώτατα οὐκ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ὡς οἶμαι σὺ<sup>60</sup> πολ-

---

*Life* of Theodore of Euchaïta, ed. H. DELEHAYE, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires*. Paris 1909, 187.15: ἐνεφώλευεν θηρίον δράκοντος. It is likely that contemporaries found this an odd use of the word ἐννεοττεύειν because in later adaptations of the *Life* of Theodore and in one class of manuscripts of the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra it is replaced with more common equivalents, cf. *Vita A*, 96 (PG 99, 200C2): ἐνεργοῦντος, *Vita C*, 51, ed. V. LATYŠEV, *Vita s. Theodori Studitae in codice Mosquensi musei Rumianzovani no. 520. VV 21 (1914) 255-304*, esp. 288.30-35: ἐνοχλοῦντος, and the manuscripts TV<sup>cd</sup> of the *Life* of Nicholas, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 49), 128, apparatus criticus: ἐμφωλεύοντας.

58 In some manuscripts we read instead: τὰ παρ' ἑτέροις δύσληπτα καὶ γριφώδη ἐξ ἰσχύος πονηθέντα.

59 See I. ŠEVČENKO, *Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period*, in A. BRYER – J. HERRIN (eds.), *Iconoclasm*. Birmingham 1977, 113-131, esp. 119, note 46: Anrich, *ibidem*, II (1917), 276 and 284 imagined that this *Vita* was the main source of *Methodius ad Theodorum* (a text certainly prior to 843 ...). In my opinion, the reverse is the case. Detailed proof cannot be given here.

60 Mss, Anrich: σοι.

τράδι καὶ παρασκευῆ ἅπαξ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ τεταγμένῃ ὥρᾳ τοῦ γάλακτος μετελάμβανεν ἱερατικῶ κανόνι καὶ πρὸ τῆς τῶν φρενῶν τελειότητος τιθηνούμενος ὁ μακαρίτης.<sup>61</sup>

But when he who was dedicated to God had been born and was fed by the maternal breast in the manner of infants, the Lord who customarily performs miracles in those who have been foreknown by him, shows here, too, what kind of conduct the great Nicholas would have in his later life, for being breastfed by the maternal teat on the other days of the week as is it customary for infants, on Wednesday and Friday the blessed one partook of milk once a day at the prescribed hour, being nursed in accordance with the priestly canon even before the perfection of the mind.<sup>62</sup>

λάκις τὴν ἡλικίαν ἢ καὶ ὑπέρακμος<sup>62</sup> τῆς τροφῆς, οὕτως τοῦ γάλακτος μετελάμβανεν ὥρα, ἀλλ' ἐν μόνῃ τῇ τεταγμένῃ, καὶ ἅπαξ, οὐ δεύτερον, τάχα τὸ τοῦ κανόνος πρὸ τῆς διαστροφῆς εὐθέτως σπαρτούμενος.<sup>63</sup>

After he has been born in this way, and has been disposed by God in this way, he shows immediately in his very infancy the fitting graces beyond his age. For still being breastfed in the manner of infants and not possessing the organ for the performance of syllogisms, he conjectured to the good pleasure of the Lord numbers of hours and measures of days most canonically on Wednesdays and Fridays, partaking of milk not at another hour, as I believe you who are much older and past your prime <partake> of food, but only at the prescribed one, and once, not twice, surely having been straightened in orderly fashion as concerns the canon before the distortion.

Michael reproduces much of the wording of his model, including the characteristic terms βρεφοπρεπῶς and γαλουχούμενος, but he eliminates elements that he considers redundant. In his version the juxtapositions ἅπαξ οὐ δεύτερον and οὐκ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ ... ἀλλ' ἐν μόνῃ τῇ are reduced to a simple ἅπαξ and ἐν τῇ. Unsurprisingly, he suppresses the aside to the addressee, ὡς οἶμαι ... οὕτως. Yet he also omits references to syllogistic reasoning and its application to time-keeping, which would have retained their function. In one case he appears to reinterpret the original. In Methodius' text the meaning of πρὸ τῆς διαστροφῆς is obscure. It could be an allusion to the Fall, so that τὸ τοῦ κανόνος would describe Adam's state of grace. In Michael's version ἱερατικῶ κανόνι is identified with the appropriate life-style for a priest, and πρὸ τῆς τῶν φρενῶν τελειότητος simply refers to the mental state of a child. This change may suggest that Michael himself did

61 *Life of Nicholas*, 5, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 115.19-116.4.

62 Mss, Anrich: ὑπεράκμους.

63 *Vita-Encomium of Nicholas by Patriarch Methodius*, 7, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 140-150, esp. 143.21-28.

not understand what Methodius was referring to. That his text is nevertheless not much shorter is due to the fact that a statement about divine foreknowledge is added, which helps the audience better to grasp the significance of the passage.

In *Vita B* of Theodore and the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra the source texts are described in very similar fashion: γλαφυρῶς ἄγαν in the former case, and βαθέως ἄγαν καὶ ἰσχνῶς (δύσληπτα καὶ γριφώδη) in the latter. This not only strengthens the case that a now lost *Life* of Theodore by Patriarch Methodius served as a model for parts of *Vita B*, but also makes it more likely that the two texts were written by the same author. That they do not resemble each other more closely could be explained by the author's metaphrastic technique. As we have seen he keeps quite close to the original texts. The only feature that could be considered characteristic of his own style is the use of elaborate 'double-barrelled' epithets. For example, we find the phrase ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος καὶ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης μεγαλόψυχος ἐργάτης Νικόλαος (Nicholas, the man of God and magnanimous worker of charity), which has no counterpart in Methodius' work.<sup>64</sup>

### *Life* of Nicholas of Stoudios

The next text to be considered is the *Life* of Nicholas (d. 868), abbot of Stoudios. It has come down to us in two versions, one of which is only known in Church Slavonic translation. They tell the same story but differ in character: the Church Slavonic version is shorter and shorn of rhetorical features. Dmitry Afinogenov has suggested that it is the original and that the Greek text is a *metaphrasis*.<sup>65</sup> Yet it seems likely that it is the other way round. Olivier Delouis has argued that the Church Slavonic version should be regarded as an *epitome* of the Greek text.<sup>66</sup> This allows us to focus on the Greek text alone. Its author is not identified in the lemma but was clearly a member of the Stoudite community.<sup>67</sup> He states that he was asked by the abbot Anatolius to add an edifying story to his text: διαγράψαι

64 *Life* of Nicholas, 14, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 120.14-15. Cf. *Vita-Encomium* of Nicholas by Methodius, 12, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 145.25-26.

65 D. AFINOGENOV, *Rewriting a Saint's Life in the Monastery of Studiou: Two Lives of St. Nicholas the Studite*, in E. KOUNTOURA-GALAKI (ed.), *The Heroes of the Orthodox Church. The New Saints, 8th to 16th century*. Athens 2004, 313-322.

66 O. DELOUIS, *Écriture et réécriture au monastère de Stoudios à Constantinople (IXe-Xe s.): quelques remarques*, in S. MARJANOVIĆ-DUŠANIĆ (ed.), *Remanier, métaphraser. Fonctions et techniques de la réécriture dans le monde byzantin*. Belgrade 2011, 101-110.

67 Anonymus *PMBZ* 30982. De Costa-Louillet's claim that the author was the fourth successor of Nicholas as abbot of Stoudios is not borne out by the evidence. Cf. G. DE COSTA – LOUILLET, *Saints de Constantinople aux VIIIe, IXe et Xe siècles*. *Byz* 25-27 (1955-1957) 794-795.

κεκέλευσμαι παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ τὸν ἀνάξιον ἐμὲ ἀποκείραντος καὶ χρόνοις πολλοῖς τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς μονὴν διΐθύνοντος (I have been commanded to write by him who tonsured me, the worthless one, and governed our monastery for many years).<sup>68</sup> Anatolios is attested in this function between the years 886 and 916.<sup>69</sup> It is possible that he was already dead when the *Life* of Nicholas was written although the present participle διΐθύνοντος gives the impression as if he had still been alive. In any case not much time will have passed between request and execution. A relatively late date is also suggested by the author's statement that a considerable amount of time had passed since Nicholas' death.<sup>70</sup> One of the posthumous miracles contains evidence that allows us to be more precise. We are told that during the time of Nicholas' second successor Hilarion the monk Anthony was healed and that he remained healthy for the next forty years.<sup>71</sup> The precise dates of Hilarion's tenure are unfortunately unknown.<sup>72</sup> Yet he must have died before 886 when Anatolios was abbot. Hilarion's predecessor Clement who became abbot in 868 is said to have been abbot of Stoudios ἐφ' ἱκανοὺς τοὺς χρόνους (over several years).<sup>73</sup> Accordingly the miracle will most likely have taken place in the 870s, which would give us the decade between 910 and 920 as a tentative date for the composition of the *Life* of Nicholas.<sup>74</sup> One can assume that it was read out in the *katholikon* of Stoudios although it is worth noting that the author uses the phrase ἐν τῷδε τῷ εὐαγεῖ τόπῳ (in this holy place) when speaking of the monastery of Kokorobion, which had been founded by Nicholas.<sup>75</sup>

It has long been recognised that the *Life* of Nicholas bears a striking resemblance to *Vita B* of Theodore.<sup>76</sup> Already in 1913 van de Vorst had juxtaposed two corresponding passages.

---

68 *Life* of Nicholas, 893A.

69 Anatolios *PMBZ* #20347.

70 *Life* of Nicholas, 921D: τὰ ἐν μακρῷ τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς σιωπῆς τῷ βυθῷ καλυπτόμενα.

71 *Life* of Nicholas, 924A-C.

72 Hilarion *PMBZ* 22601.

73 *Life* of Nicholas, 924A. See Klemes *PMBZ* 23705: 'Er war nur vier Monate im Amt', which is incorrect.

74 See A. KAZHDAN, Nicholas of Stoudios. *ODB*, II (1991) 1471: 'His Vita ... was written by an anonymous Studite monk ca. 915-930'.

75 *Life* of Nicholas, 912A.

76 In the *Pinakes* of the *Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* it is listed as a work of Michael the Stoudite, without supporting evidence.

*Life of Nicholas of Stoudios*

Ἐρρέτω φθόνος ὁ κατὰ τούτων κινούμενος, καὶ χεῖρα ἐπὶ στόμα τὸ ἑαυτῶν τιθέτωσαν οἱ ἐμβρόντητοι, οἱ τῆ σφῶν κακία τοὺς τῆς οἰκουμένης φωστήρας, κατ' ἀλλήλων μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἀθυροστομοῦντες ἐνδιαβάλλουσι.<sup>77</sup>

Let envy be gone, which is directed against them, and let put the hand on their mouth the fools who slander the luminaries of the world through their own badness, and slander shamelessly against each other until now.

Van de Vorst was of the opinion that the *Life of Nicholas* was dependent on *Vita B of Theodore*, and that it was written at a later date by another author.<sup>79</sup> More recently, Olivier Delouis appears to have come to the same conclusion.<sup>80</sup> Yet a closer look at the texts reveals that matters are much less straightforward. Van de Vorst had identified further parallels.

*Life of Nicholas*

Τὴν προσπελάζουσαν τῷ Ἀκρίτα χερρόνησον, τὴν ἐπώνυμον τοῦ μεγάλου μάρτυρος κατελήφασιν Τρύφωνος.

Κάκεισε λοιπὸν τῷ πολυάθλει πατρὶ καὶ παμμάκαρι Θεοδώρῳ τὸ κοινὸν τοῦ βίου τέλος ἐφέστηκεν, ἑνδεκάτῃ τοῦ Νοεμβρίου μηνὸς εὐκλεῶς πρὸς κύριον ἐκδημήσαντος.

Οὗ τὸ μακάριον σκῆνος μετακομισθὲν πρὸς τῆ γείτονι νήσῳ τῆ καλουμένη Πριγκίπῳ τῆ εὐκλεεῖ καὶ ὁσία ταφῆ παραδίδοται.<sup>82</sup>

*Vita B of Theodore*

Ἐρρέτω φθόνος ὁ κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου Θεοδώρου κατεξανιστάμενος, αἰσχυνέσθωσαν δὴ καὶ οἱ ἐνδιαβάλλοντες τὸν θεοειδῆ καὶ τῶν μοναζόντων καθηγητὴν καὶ διδάσκαλον, καὶ χεῖρα τιθέτωσαν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰ λόγια χεῖλεσιν.<sup>78</sup>

Let envy be gone, which rises up against the righteous Theodore, let also be put to shame those who slander the godlike leader and teacher of the monks, and let them put the hand on their lips, as Scripture says.

*Vita B of Theodore*

Τὴν προσπελάζουσαν τῷ Ἀκρίτα χερρόνησον, τὴν ἐπιλεγομένην τοῦ ἁγίου Τρύφωνος ἀποπλεῖ.<sup>81</sup>

...

...

Οὗ τὸ πανίερρον καὶ τληπαθὲς σκῆνωμα τῆς προρρηθείσης χερρονήσου πρὸς τὴν Πρίγκιπον τηνικάδε μετακομισθὲν αὐτόθι τὴν ἀρμόδιον ψαλμωδίαν τε καὶ κατάθεσιν δέχεται.<sup>83</sup>

77 *Life of Nicholas*, 892A. The prepositional phrase κατ' ἀλλήλων may be corrupt.

78 *Vita B of Theodore*, 62, 320CD.

79 VAN DE VORST, La translation (cited n. 16), 32.

80 DELOUIS, Saint-Jean-Baptiste (cited n. 11), 330, n. 3.

81 *Vita B of Theodore*, 61, 320A.

82 *Life of Nicholas*, 900AB.

83 *Vita B of Theodore*, 68, 325D-328A.

They arrived at the peninsula that is near Akritas, which is named after the great martyr Trypho.

And there the common end of life then came to the much-tested and most blessed Theodore, who gloriously departed to the Lord on the eleventh day of the month of November.

His blessed body was translated to the neighbouring island that is named Prinkipos and given over to a glorious and holy burial.

He sailed to the peninsula that is near Akritas, which is named after St Trypho.

...

...

His most sacred and suffering body was then translated from the aforementioned peninsula to Prinkipos and there received the fitting psalmody and deposition.

Both texts relate that before his death Theodore moved to the monastery of St Trypho on Cape Akritas and that his corpse was then brought to the island of Prinkipo where it was buried, and they do so in almost the same words. Van de Vorst was of the opinion that the passages had been adapted from Naucratius' *Encyclic*. Yet there we find no counterpart that could have served as a model for the later texts.<sup>84</sup> Indeed, as van de Vorst himself pointed out no place name is mentioned.<sup>85</sup> The same applies to another Stoudite source, the account of the translation of Theodore's relics that was edited by van de Vorst. This text knows nothing of a stay of Theodore at St Trypho and a subsequent moving of his body. Instead, it claims that the saint died on Prinkipo and was then buried there.<sup>86</sup> This raises the question: what other source could Nicholas' hagiographer have used? In order to find an answer we need to consider the immediately following sentence.

Ἄλλὰ περὶ τούτου ἔνιοι τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἱερομυστῶν ἀνεγράψαντο δῶρον ὡσπερ τι φερωνύμως τὰς αὐτοῦ ἀριστείας κοινωφελὲς διαζωγραφήσαντες.<sup>87</sup>

But about this some among the sacred initiators of the church have written, having described his struggles as some gift of common profit in accordance with his name.

Van de Vorst thought that this person is to be identified with the author of *Vita B* of Theodore. At first sight this seems to rule out that the two texts were written by the same person since it would be very odd if the hagiographer referred to himself in this way. Yet this does not necessarily mean that van de Vorst's hypothesis is correct. We have seen that the formula τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἱερομύστης also appears

84 *Encyclic* of Naucratius, 1849AB

85 VAN DE VORST, La translation (cited n. 16), 33.

86 *Translatio* of Theodore and Joseph, 9, ed. VAN DE VORST, 55.35-37.

87 *Life* of Nicholas, 900B.



in *Vita B* of Theodore. There it has the meaning of patriarch or bishop, and we can assume that the same applies to the *Life* of Nicholas. Michael, however, was a simple monk. Above I have argued that the author of *Vita B* refers to Patriarch Methodius, and this is likely also the case in the *Life* of Nicholas. We have seen that in *Vita B* the reference to the translation of Theodore's relics to Prinkipo is immediately followed by a reference to the later translation to the Stoudios monastery. Here Methodius is explicitly mentioned as the one who officiated at the event.<sup>88</sup> If the patriarch wrote a *life* of Theodore for this occasion it could have become the model not only for *Vita B* of Theodore but also for the *Life* of Nicholas.

A closer look at the passage reveals that the relationship between the different texts is anything but straightforward. In the *Life* of Nicholas Theodore's death is mentioned in just one sentence whereas *Vita B* gives a lengthy account of the events. As a consequence the references to Cape Akritas and to Prinkipo, which in the *Life* of Nicholas are mentioned in the same paragraph, are separated from one another by several chapters. At this point one might conclude that in this case the version in the *Life* of Nicholas is an *epitome* of *Vita B* of Theodore. Yet this is not necessarily the case. The intervening chapters in *Vita B* contain the paraphrase of Naucratius' *Encyclic* about the death of the saint, which we have already discussed before. Accordingly, we find with τῆς προρρηθείσης χερρονήσου a reference to τὴν προσπελάζουσαν τῷ Ἀκρίτᾳ χερρόνησον in the earlier passage. Thus one can argue that in *Vita B* Naucratius' account is intercalated between two passages that originally followed one another directly. The direct source for both texts may thus have been Methodius' lost *Life* of Theodore.

Can we now conclude that the two texts were written by the same author? Comparison reveals the existence of further passages that are very similar to one another. A striking example can be found in the early parts of the *lives*.

#### *Vita B* of Theodore

Διὸ οὕτως ὑπετάσσετο τῷ αἰοιδίμῳ Πλάτωνι, συστολὴν ἤθους καὶ φρονήματος, οὐ μόνον εἰς αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐφεξῆς μείζονάς τε καὶ ἐλάττονας ἐπιδεικνύμενος, ὡς οὐ θελητός τις ὢν καὶ ἀβούλητος ἄνθρωπος, ἢ ἀνδριάς ἄψυχος τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου τὰς σάρκας ἔχων καθηλωμένης, καὶ ἄπρακτος διαμένων

#### *Life* of Nicholas

Ὅλον γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ἐκδεδωκὼς οὕτοσί ὁ πανόλβιος τῷ ἐκείνου θελήματι, καθάπερ τις ἀθέλητος ἄνθρωπος ἦν τό γε εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἦκον, πόρρω καὶ μακρὰν τῶν οἰκείων θελημάτων γινόμενος, οὐ πρὸς αὐτόν (sc. τὸν ὄσιον Θεόδωρον) δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐφεξῆς μικροὺς τε καὶ μεγάλους, τὴν αὐτὴν εὐπίθειαν καὶ ὑπα-

88 *Vita B* of Theodore, 68, 328A.

πρὸς πᾶν ὃ περπερεία καὶ ζήλος, καὶ φθόνος καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ ἐριθεία, διὰ τῆς τοῦ νοῦς ἀπροσεξίας οἶδεν ἀπογεννᾶν.<sup>89</sup>

Therefore he subjected himself to the famous Plato, displaying abasement of attitude and pride, not only in relation to him, but in relation to the subsequent greater and lesser ones, as a human being who is without will and wish, or a soulless statue, whose flesh was nailed down through the fear of the Lord, and remained inactive in regard of everything that boasting and jealousy and envy and aggression and anger and strife is wont to bring forth through the inattentiveness of the mind.

κοὴν πράως μετὰ τῆς τοῦ φρονήματος συστολῆς ἐπεδείκνυεν, οἷόν τις ἄψυχος ἀνδριάς ἐστηλωμένος τῷ θείῳ φόβῳ πρὸς ἅπαντας, ἀπρακτος δὲ διαμένων πρὸς πᾶν ὃ περπερεία καὶ ζήλος, θυμὸς τε καὶ ὀργή, καὶ ἀπέχθεια.<sup>90</sup>

This most blessed one, having given himself over completely to that one's will, was like some human being who is without will as far as it concerned him, having distanced himself far from his own will, not only in relation to him (sc. the pious Theodore), but also in relation to the subsequent small and great ones, he meekly showed the same docility and obedience together with the abasement of his pride, like some soulless statue, put up for all through divine fear, remaining inactive in regard of everything that boasting and envy, aggression and anger, and hatred.

These passages are more significant than those identified by van de Vorst because they do not tell the same story but two analogous ones: Theodore's life as a young monk in the monastery of Plato, and Nicholas' life as a young monk in the monastery of Theodore. One explanation for this parallel would be that both texts are the work of one author, who would have recycled elements, perhaps with the aim of showing that Nicholas and Theodore both exemplified the same coenobitic ideal. Yet the very similarity of the two passages allows for an alternative explanation. A different author could have mined an already existing text by another writer for suitable material, a practice not unknown in Byzantine hagiography. This impasse is difficult to overcome. One possible way out is to identify common features that appear in the two texts in completely different contexts. One such feature is the prolific use of epithets. To give just one example, Theodore is introduced as τῆς Χριστοῦ ὁμολογίας πυρσολαμπῆς στύλος (brightly shining pillar of the confession of Christ) in *Vita B*, and Nicholas is called πυρσολαμπῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας στύλος (brightly shining pillar of the church) in the *Life* of Nicholas.<sup>91</sup>

89 *Vita B* of Theodore 6, 242C.

90 *Life* of Nicholas, 872D. Here a verb appears to be missing at the end.

91 *Vita B* of Theodore 1, 233; and *Life* of Nicholas, 859C, 900B. Cf. also 881A: ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ τῆς νίκης ἐπώνυμος; 881A: τὸ πυρσολαμπῆς ... τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐντρέφημα; and 885C: τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας στύλον Θεόδωρον.

They could be considered a marker of the distinctive style of one single author. If this hypothesis is correct, the two texts would have been written by Michael the Monk. Indeed, it seems likely that the πατέρων αιδεσιμώτατοι (most venerable of fathers) who commissioned *Vita B* are to be identified with the Stoudite abbot Anatolius. This is not to say that there are no differences between the two texts. The *Life* of Nicholas contains references to ancient poetry,<sup>92</sup> and it displays grammatical erudition in phrases like Θεόδωρος ὁ ἐκ χωρίου τοῦ Σανταβάρεως ἐξορμώμενος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Σανταβαρηνὸς παρωνύμως ὑπὸ τινων ἐπονομαζόμενος (Theodore who comes from the village of Santabaris and who is therefore paronymically called by some the Santabarene), where the precise grammatical term for 'derivation' (παρωνυμία) is used.<sup>93</sup> These elements are missing in *Vita B* of Theodore. This discrepancy could be explained by the fact that *Vita B* of Theodore was intended for a wider and less learned audience. That Michael did not just follow orders but was personally impressed by Nicholas is suggested by a passage in the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra, which was not written for a Stoudite audience. Whereas Methodius had simply stated that those who had been given the saint's name were blessed Michael speaks about one particular individual: παρ' οὗ χάριτος πολλῆς ἠξιωμένους διέγνωμεν καὶ τοὺς δι' αὐτὸν τὴν αὐτοῦ προσηκαμένους κλήσιν καὶ βίου μετεσχηκότας ἀγγελικοῦ καὶ θαυμάτων ποιητὰς γεγονέναι (we know that those who because of him have accepted his appellation have been deigned worthy of great grace and have participated in the angelic life and then become workers of wonders).<sup>94</sup> As Anrich has already pointed out it seems likely that this wonderworking monk is no other than the Stoudite abbot.<sup>95</sup>

92 See e.g. *Life* of Nicholas, 873B: διὰ λύδιον ἄρμα θέειν. Cf. LIDDELL & SCOTT, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. Λύδιος, with references to Diogenianus and Gregory of Cyprus.

93 *Life* of Nicholas, 912B. See also 916D: Θεόφιλος δὲ ὁ κατὰ τοὺς Μελισσηνοὺς Λυδιάτης καλούμενος· γαμβρὸς γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐχρημάτιζεν καὶ τὸ ἐκ γένους ἐκείνοις παρωνύμως ἐπιτεθέν· εἰκότως γὰρ καὶ οὗτος καταχρηστικῶς ἐτετίμητο ἀξιώματι, and even more strikingly, 924A: ὁ τοῦ ὀσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Νικολάου μαθητῆς Ἀντώνιος τοῦνομα, ὁ τῷ συμβεβηκῆτι παρωνύμως τῇ προσηγορίᾳ Μαῦρος παρά τισιν ἐπονομαζόμενος, 901A: καὶ παρωνύμως Θεόφιλος προσαγορευόμενος. On the concept of παρωνυμία see F. A. LEWIS, *Substance and Predication in Aristotle*. Cambridge 1991, 89.

94 *Life* of Nicholas, 49, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 137.24-138.32.

95 See ANRICH, II (cited n. 51), 269-270.

*Life of Blaise of Amorium*

At this point we need to consider a further Stoudite text, the *Life of Blaise of Amorium* (d. 908/12), which was written after the year 916 since it refers to the abbot Anatolius as οὗτος ὁ αἰοίδιμος (that famous one), thus indicating that he was deceased.<sup>96</sup> The text bears a structural resemblance to the *Life of Nicholas of Stoudios* since it also contains an edifying story that is not related to the main narrative.<sup>97</sup> Even the wording is similar: εἰ καὶ παρεκβατικώτερον πως ὠφέλιμον οὖσαν τὴν διήγησιν (the story being profitable even if it is a digression) in the *Life of Blaise* corresponds to παρεκβατικώτερον διελθόντας ... διήγησιν ὠφέλιμον (having recounted a profitable story ... by way of digression) in the *Life of Nicholas*.<sup>98</sup> In addition, Anatolius is again presented as the one who tonsured the hagiographer: ὁ πάντας ἡμᾶς ὡς ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ τῆς κοσμικῆς ἀχλὺς ἀφαρπάσας εἶθ' οὕτως διὰ τῆς καλῆς ὁμολογίας τῷ ἀγγελικῷ τῆς εὐφροσύνης περιβολαίῳ τοῦ σχήματος πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιβίβασας ἀκρότητα (he who snatched us all away from the worldly murk as in a dry place, and then led us through the good confession through the angelic robe of joy, the habit, to the height of virtue).<sup>99</sup> For these reasons Henri Grégoire considered the possibility that the two texts were written by the same author.<sup>100</sup> Comparison shows that they have indeed more features in common. Particular striking is the use of the noun ὑπουρία, a variant of the classical ὑπώρεια. As Stephanos Efthymiadis has highlighted, it appears only in the *Life of Blaise*, in the phrases πρὸς τὴν ὑπουρίαν τοῦ Ἄθωνος (at the foothills of Athos) and πρὸς ὑπουρίαν ἐν γεωλόφοις τόποις (at the foothills in mountainous places), and in the *Life of Nicholas*, in the phrase κατὰ τὴν Ἀτρώας ὑπουρίαν (at the foothills of Atroa).<sup>101</sup> In addition, one can point out that the formula μαστιγίας οἰκέτης (servant who wants whipping) appears in both texts,<sup>102</sup> and that the phrase τῷ ἀρότρῳ τῶν ἐντολῶν ὡσημέραι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐλακα γεωροῦμενος (each day tilling the furrow of the soul with the plough of the commandments) in the *Life of Nicholas* closely resembles τῷ ἀρότρῳ τῶν ἐντολῶν τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς διερχόμενος αὐλακα (traversing the furrow of the soul

96 *Life of Blaise*, 19, ed. H. DELEHAYE, *Vita S. Blasii Amoriensis (AASS Novembris, IV)*. Brussels 1925, 666D.

97 *Life of Nicholas*, 987D, and *Life of Blaise*, 2, ed. DELEHAYE, 658B.

98 *Life of Blaise*, 10, 659E; and *Life of Nicholas*, 898D.

99 *Life of Blaise*, 19, ed. DELEHAYE, 666C.

100 H. GRÉGOIRE, *La vie de saint Blaise d' Amorium. Byz 5 (1929-1930) 391-414*, esp. 413. See also DELOUIS, *Saint-Jean-Baptiste* (cited n. 11), 348.

101 *Life of Blaise*, 23, 24, ed. DELEHAYE, 667DF; and *Life of Nicholas*, 893B (*PG: ὑπουργίαν*). See S. EFTHYMIADIS, *Hagiographica varia (9th-10th c.)*. *JÖB 48 (1998) 41-48*, esp. 43.

102 *Life of Blaise*, 4, ed. DELEHAYE, 658E; and *Life of Nicholas*, 865B.

with the plough of the commandments) in the *Life* of Blaise.<sup>103</sup> Moreover, there is also a parallel with the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra where ὡς καὶ ἐκ μόνης ὀράσεως αὐτοῦ τοὺς παρατυγχάνοντας αὐτῷ βελτιοῦν (so that he improved those who met with him even when they just saw him) is similar to ἐβελτίου γὰρ τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ μόνον ἐπ' ὄψεσιν ὁ ἀνὴρ θεωρούμενος (the man improved the many when he was seen with eyes alone) in the *Life* of Blaise.<sup>104</sup> This evidence seems to suggest that the *Life* of Blaise was written by Michael. Yet one should also be aware that the texts differ considerably from one another. The *Life* of Nicholas is more 'rhetorical' than the *Life* of Blaise, which presents a straightforward narrative. One looks in vain for the complex epithets, which the *Life* of Nicholas has in common with *Vita B* of Theodore.<sup>105</sup> This is indeed puzzling. One wonders whether the *Life* of Blaise was not written by another Stoudite monk who took his inspiration from Michael's texts.

#### *Encomium* of Isaacius and Dalmatus

Michael the Monk was very active in the service of the Stoudite community. Yet this does not mean that he remained in the monastery in which he had been tonsured. As we have seen he is called ἀρχιμανδρίτης in one of the recensions of the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra. This was the title of the abbots of the monastery of Dalmatos who supervised the monastic establishments of the capital as agents of the patriarchate.<sup>106</sup> A letter by Theodore of Stoudios shows how these functionaries were chosen. They were elected by the abbots of the capital and then installed by the patriarch.<sup>107</sup> We have a speech in honour of the founding fathers of the monastery, which bears the title Μιχαὴλ μοναχοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τοὺς ὀσίους πατέρας Ἰσακίον τε καὶ Δαλμάτον (*encomium* of the pious fathers Isaac and Dalmatus by Michael the Monk).<sup>108</sup> This text is extant in a single manuscript,

103 *Life* of Blaise, 10, 662D; and *Life* of Nicholas, 872B.

104 *Life* of Blaise, 16, 664E; and *Life* of Nicholas of Myra, 40, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 133.20-21.

105 Cf. e.g. *Life* of Blaise, 2, 658A: ὁ ἐν ἀγίοις πατὴρ ἡμῶν Βλάσιος; 7, 660A Εὐστράτιος ... ὁ θαυμάσιος; 11, 662EF: ὁ μέγας καὶ θαυμάσιος ἄνθρωπος; 19, 666C: Ἀνατόλιος ὁ θαυμάσιος.

106 See G. DAGRON, *Les moines et la ville: Le monachisme à Constantinople*. *TM* 4 (1970) 229-276, esp. 269.

107 See DELOUIS, *Saint-Jean-Baptiste* (cited n. 11), 122-123.

108 P. HATLIE, *The Encomium of Ss. Isakos and Dalmatos by Michael the Monk (BHG 956d): Text, Translation and Notes*, in V. RUGGIERI – L. PIERALLI (eds.), *EYKOΣMIA. Studi miscellanei per il 75° di Vincenzo Poggi S.J. Catanzaro 2003*, 275-311.

the Codex Parisinus graecus 548, and was copied in the eleventh century.<sup>109</sup> It was delivered at the church of the monastery because the author begs the saints to intercede for their flock: μέμνησθε καὶ νῦν τῆς ὑμετέρας μάνδρας (remember now, too, your sheepfold). The author refers to himself as abbot when he asks for the saint's support: ὡσάν καὶ τὸν μισθὸν εὔροιμεν οἱ ἀνάξιοι μετὰ πάντων τῶν θεοσεβῶς ὁμοῦ καὶ φιλαγίως ποιμανευσάντων (so that we, the worthless ones, may find the reward with all those who have been both orthodox and saint-loving shepherds).<sup>110</sup> The editor Peter Hatlie did not attempt to identify the author but the evidence from the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra suggests that he was Michael the Monk who had transferred from Stoudios to Dalmatos. The text brims with rare words, which were glossed by the copyist of the manuscript.<sup>111</sup> The difference in stylistic register makes it difficult to compare it with the works of Michael that we have already discussed. Yet we do encounter elaborate 'double-barrelled' epithets such as ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας συνήγορος καὶ τῆς τριάδος ἰφθιμώτατος πρόμαχος (the advocate of truth and most valiant forefighter of the Trinity),<sup>112</sup> as well as the compound θεοπάροχος,<sup>113</sup> which seems to be a pet word of the author since it also appears in *Vita B* of Theodore and the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra, and as we will see also in most *encomia* that can be attributed to him.

The *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus is based on the Late Antique *Lives* of the two saints. In this case, however, the paraphrase is not very close, undoubtedly because of the low stylistic register of the original text.

#### *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus

Ἀλλὰ καὶ μὴν καὶ τῆς Ἥλιου τοῦ προφήτου καὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ πάλιν Μωσέως μετέσχε νηστείας· τεσσαράκοντα γὰρ καὶ οὕτως ἡμερῶν ἄσιτος ἐκτελέσας δόλιχον, ἄλλων τοσοῦτων μετὰ προσθήκης τριῶν παράκλησιν οἰονεὶ ἄυλον ὑψόθεν εισδέχεται καὶ ὀπτασίας θείας καταξιοῦται τοῦ

#### *Life* of Dalmatus

Ὁ δὲ ἅγιος Δαλμάτιος τὰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας τῆς ἁγίας τεσσαρακοστῆς ἐφεξῆς ἐνήστευσεν ἕως τῆς ἁγίας πέμπτης· καὶ τότε λειτουργήσαντες μετέλαβον τροφῆς, καὶ ὀψίας γεναμένης, ἀνέπαυσεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ σκαμνίον καὶ κατηνέχθη ἡμέρας ἄλλας τεσσαράκοντα τρεῖς, καὶ

109 See HATLIE, *The Encomium* (cited n. 108), 276.

110 *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus, 33, ed. HATLIE (cited n. 108), 293.16-17.

111 These are παιώνια· φάρμακα, εὔγε· ὦ, δόλιχον· μήκος, φροῦδον· ἀφανές, θῶκον· θρόνον, Θεοπολιτῶν· Ἀντιοχείας, ἐτοπάζετο· ὑπενοεῖτο, ἀλιτήμων· ἀμαρτωλός, ἐνὶ τῶν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν συντεθραμμένων· Εὐσέβιος ἦν οὗτος ὁ ἀπὸ φιλοσόφων γεγωνός ὁ καὶ τὸν Εὐτυχή ὑστερον θηρεύσας καὶ στηλιτεύσας, ἰαλεμώδους· θρήνου ἀξίας ἢ οὐδενὸς λόγου ἀξίας, ἄθρει· θεώρει, νόει, ἀριφραδῶς· φανερώς.

112 *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus, 12, ed. HATLIE (cited n. 108), 281.22-23.

113 *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus, 5, ed. HATLIE (cited n. 108), 278.17: εἶδες, ἀγαπητέ, τὴν θεοπάροχον χάριν τῶν διδασκαλίων.

προορᾶν ἔνθεν τὰ μέλλοντα τῆς χάριτος ἀπαρξάμενος.<sup>114</sup>

But indeed he also partook of the fasting of the prophet Elijah and of Moses himself in the old days, for having remained without food for the course of forty days, he receives from above a so-to-speak immaterial consolation for another <course> that is just as long with the addition of three and is deigned worthy of a divine vision, from then on beginning to see the future of grace.

ἔμεινεν κείμενος ἐν τῷ σκάμνῳ αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσών, καὶ ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτοῦ προσευχόμενος ἕως τῆς ἀγίας ἀναλήψεως· ἦν γὰρ κατενεχθεὶς καὶ μόνον ὅτι ἀνέπνεεν ἔκειτο γὰρ ἐν ἑκστάσει.<sup>115</sup>

The holy Dalmatius fasted the forty days of the holy Lent until the holy Thursday, and then when they had officiated and partaken of food, and when evening had come, he reclined on a stool and was weighed down for a further forty-three days, and remained lying, reclining on his stool, and praying in his mind, until the holy Ascension, for he was weighed down and barely breathing, for he lay in ecstasis.

Despite the different phrasing the passage of the *encomium* is clearly based on the *life*. The original text is somewhat shortened – no mention is made of the σκάμνος – but complemented with references to Old Testament figures in order to stress the greatness of Dalmatus' achievement. In the next paragraph the discrepancy is greater. In the *Life* of Dalmatus we find a detailed account of a visionary experience of the saint, which in Michael's *encomium* is reduced to a couple of sentences. Other episodes in the *Life*, such as a story about Dalmatus' role as an arbiter in law cases, are not mentioned at all,<sup>116</sup> possibly because the author found them too pedestrian. In any case, the *encomium* was never meant to replace the older text because Michael explains: τὰ πλείω παρήκεν ὁ λόγος συντομίας εἵνεκα τοὺς φιλευσεβεῖς ἀκροατὰς ἐπὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν παραπέμπων ἱστορικὴν πραγματείαν (the speech has left out the greater part for the sake of conciseness, referring the pious listeners to the historical account about them).<sup>117</sup>

The *encomium* deals with the lives of two men who had been dead for centuries. Yet this does not mean that it is a disinterested text. It stakes a claim, namely that the monastery of Dalmatos is the foremost house in the capital and that its abbots should act as supervisors of all Constantinopolitan communities. In the Late Antique *Life* of Dalmatus this claim was buttressed with a forged letter of

114 *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus, 16, ed. HATLIE (cited n. 108), 284.7-10.

115 *Life* of Dalmatus, ed. A. BANDURI, *Imperium orientale sive antiquitates Constantino-politanae*, IV. Paris 1711, 697-710, esp. 698AB.

116 *Life* of Dalmatus, ed. BANDURI (cited n. 115), 699CD.

117 *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus, 29, ed. HATLIE (cited n. 108), 291.13-15.

the Council of Ephesus to the saint. This letter is also found in the *encomium*.

*Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatu

Θεσπίζομεν τοίνυν, φησί, τὸν κύριον Δαλμάτον καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτὸν μέλλοντας ἡγεμονεύειν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς μοναστηρίου αὐτοῦ, εἶναι ἐξάρχους τῶν εὐαγῶν μοναστηρίων τῶν τε νῦν ὄντων καὶ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἔσεσθαι μελλόντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.<sup>118</sup>

We then decree, it says, that the Lord Dalmatus and those who will be abbots of his pious monastery after him, shall be exarchs of the pious monasteries, that exist now and that will exist later in Constantinople.

*Life* of Dalmatus

Θεσπίζομεν τοίνυν τὸν κύριον Δαλμάτιον, καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτὸν μέλλοντας ἡγεμονεύειν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς μοναστηρίου αὐτοῦ, εἶναι ἐξάρχους τῶν εὐαγῶν μοναστηρίων τῶν τε νῦν ὄντων καὶ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἔσεσθαι μελλόντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.<sup>119</sup>

We then decree, it says, that the Lord Dalmatius and those who will be abbots of his pious monastery after him, shall be exarchs of the pious monasteries, that exist now and that will exist later in Constantinople.

In this case the text of the *Vorlage* is copied faithfully, evidently in order to reinforce the validity of the claim. Whether as abbot of Dalmatos Michael still held such a position or whether this was merely wishful thinking can no longer be ascertained.

*Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel

The *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel was edited 1996 by Tatiana Matantseva who also offered a detailed analysis of its content.<sup>120</sup> It is extant in two tenth-century manuscripts, the Codex Parisinus graecus 1180, and the Codex Vaticanus graecus 1669, which was copied at the Studios monastery and also contains *Vita B* of Theodore.<sup>121</sup> This suggests strongly that Michael was still monk there when he wrote the text. Indeed, he appears to have destined it for the Stoudite community, since he addresses his audience as πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί (fathers and brothers) and asks the angels to help τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς Ναζιραίους (us Nazireans), although one cannot exclude that laypeople were also present.<sup>122</sup> In addition, the phrase 'the infantile nature in Christ' (ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν νηπιάζουσα φύσις) may

118 *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus, 28, ed. HATLIE (cited n. 108), 290.22-26.

119 *Life* of Dalmatus, ed. BANDURI (cited n. 115), 709C.

120 MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited n. 7), 105-116.

121 MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited n. 7), 98-101.

122 *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, 8, 13, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited n. 7), 141.1, 147.3-4.



be a reference to children that were being brought up in the monastery.<sup>123</sup> The text itself is written in elevated but rather clumsy Greek and abounds in Pseudo-Dionysian terminology and other rare vocabulary, which in the Vaticanus graecus 1669 is glossed in the margins.<sup>124</sup> As before we need to ask whether it displays features that can be found in the texts that we have already discussed. Matantseva was pointed by Joseph Paramelle to a parallel with *Vita B* of Theodore.

*Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel

Πιπτέτω φθόνος δεινός τῶν εἰκονομάχων, ἐμφραττέσθω τὰ στόματα τῶν λαλούντων κατὰ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰκόνας ἀνομίαν ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ καὶ ἐξουδενώσει.<sup>125</sup>

Let there be gone the terrible envy of the iconoclasts, let there be stuffed the mouths of those who speak unlawfully against the icon of our Christ and God in prideful and overbearing behaviour.

*Vita B* of Theodore

Ἐρρέτω φθόνος ὁ κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου Θεοδώρου κατεξανιστάμενος, αἰσχυνέσθωσαν δὴ καὶ οἱ ἐνδιαβάλλοντες τὸν θεοειδῆ καὶ τῶν μοναζόντων καθηγητὴν καὶ διδάσκαλον, καὶ χεῖρα τιθέτωσαν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰ λόγια χεῖλεσιν.<sup>126</sup>

Let there be gone the envy that rises up against the righteous Theodore, let there be put to shame those who slander the God-like instructor and teacher of the monks, and let them put a hand on their lips, to say it with Scripture.

Here we have twice the same formula, followed in each case by a Biblical quotation, in the former case Job 5:16 and in the latter Wisdom 8:12.

An even closer link exists with the *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus. Both texts include exposés of Trinitarian theology, which are inspired by John of Damascus' *Exposition of Faith*.

John of Damascus,  
*Expositio fidei*

Ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ἢ μὲν τῶν ὑποστάσεων διαίρεσις πραγματι θεωρεῖται, ἢ δὲ κοινότης καὶ ἡ συνάφεια καὶ τὸ ἐν λόγῳ καὶ ἐπινοία θεω-

*Encomium* of Michael  
and Gabriel

Ἄσθεν ἐπὶ ἡμῶν μὲν ἢ τῆς φύσεως ἐνότης λόγῳ καὶ ἐπινοία θεωρεῖται, ἢ δὲ τῶν ὑποστάσεων διαίρεσις πραγματι διὰ τὰς προειρημένας ἐπιθεωρεῖται αἰτίας,

*Encomium* of Isaac  
and Dalmatus

Ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν κτισμάτων πραγματικῶς<sup>127</sup> τὰ ὄντα διαιρούμενα λόγῳ καὶ ἐπινοία τὴν ἔνωση τῆς φύσεως ἐπιδέχεται, ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ ἀνάπαλιν τὸ μὲν τῆς

123 See MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited. n. 7), 115.

124 See MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited. n. 7), 124.

125 *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, 12, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited. n. 7), 145.37-39.

126 *Vita B* of Theodore 62, 320CD.

127 Ms: πρικῶς, Hatlie: πατερικῶς.

ρεῖται. ... ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ ὑπερουσίου καὶ πάντων ἐπέκεινα καὶ ἀλήπτου τριάδος τὸ ἀνάπαλιν. ἐκεῖ γὰρ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν καὶ ἕν πράγματι θεωρεῖται ... ἐπινοία δὲ τὸ διηρημένον.<sup>128</sup>

In the case of all creatures, then, the division of the hypostases is seen in reality, whereas the commonality and the cohesion and the one are seen through reason and in thought. ... But in the case of the holy and super-substantial and completely transcendent and incomprehensible triad the opposite holds true ... For there the common and one is seen in reality ... whereas that which is divided is seen in thought.

ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀπροσίτου καὶ ἀκαταλήπτου τριάδος, τὸ ἀνάπαλιν. ἐκεῖ γὰρ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν καὶ ἕν πράγματι θεωρεῖται ... ἐπινοία δὲ τὸ διηρημένον.<sup>129</sup>

Therefore, in our case the oneness of nature is seen only through reason and in thought, whereas the division of the hypostases is seen in reality because of the aforementioned reasons. But in the case of the inaccessible and incomprehensible triad, the opposite holds true. For there the common and one is seen in reality ... whereas that which is divided is seen in thought.

φύσεως συνεχὲς καὶ ἕν<sup>130</sup> πράγματι θεωρεῖται, ἢ δὲ τῶν ὑποστάσεων διάκρισις ἐπινοία καταλαμβάνεται.<sup>131</sup>

In the case of the creatures the beings are divided in reality and receive the union of the nature through reason and in thought, whereas here the opposite holds true: the continuity and oneness of nature is seen in reality whereas the distinction of the hypostases is comprehended in thought.

In the *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel John's statement is quoted with only minor modifications whereas in the *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus we find a shortened paraphrase. The language is quite technical and not an obvious choice for a rhetorical text,<sup>132</sup> which strengthens the hypothesis that both *encomia* were written by the same author.

128 John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, 8, ed. B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, II: *Expositio fidei* (PTS, 12). Berlin – New York 1973, 28.238–244, 29.250–253.

129 *Encomium of Michael and Gabriel*, 3, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited. n. 7), 134.23–31.

130 Ms and Hatlie: ἐν.

131 *Encomium of Isaac and Dalmatus*, 13, ed. HATLIE (cited. n. 108), 282.27–30.

132 See D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Responding to John Philoponus: Hypostases, Particular Substances and Perichoresis in the Trinity*. *Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture* 9 (2015) 13–28. I have not been able to find a parallel in other *encomia* dating to the post-Iconoclastic period.

*Encomia* of Philip, Daniel and Eustratius

In the Vaticanus graecus 1669 we find not only *Vita B* of Theodore and the *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, but also an *encomium* of the Apostle Philip, which is likewise attributed to ‘Michael the Monk’ (Μιχαήλ μοναχοῦ). This suggests that we are dealing with the same author. A similar case is the Codex Chalcensis 88 where we find not only the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra but also two *encomia*, of the prophet Daniel and the three youths and of the martyr Eustratius and his companions, by Michael the Monk. Both manuscripts are old. As we have seen the Vaticanus has been dated to the early tenth century, and the Chalcensis may have been copied already at the end of the ninth century.<sup>133</sup> In the case of the *Encomium* of Eustratius we have a clear parallel with the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra, which supports the attribution. The phrase ἡμεῖς δὲ συντόμῳ λόγῳ καὶ ἀσθενεῖ διὰ τοὺς ἡμᾶς εὐσεβῶς βιασαμένους τὰ τῶν μαρτύρων ἄθλα διεξιόντες (but we discuss the struggles of the martyrs in a concise and feeble speech because of those who have piously forced us) is very similar to οἱ τε ἀναξίως ταῦτά σοι προσκομίσαντες ... καὶ οἱ πρὸς τοῦτο ἡμᾶς εὐσεβῶς βιασάμενοι χρῆζομέν σοι τῆς ἀντιλήψεως (those who without being worthy have presented this to you ... and those who have piously forced us need your support) in the latter text.<sup>134</sup> Moreover, we encounter an interest in the etymology of names, which has counterparts in *Vita B* of Theodore and in the *Life* of Nicholas of Stoudios. At the beginning of the text we read: ἡ δὲ γε προσηγορία τῆς ἐκάστου τῶν ἀριστεῶν ὑποστάσεως τὴν τῆς οἰκείας πολιτείας διὰ πράξεως ὑποσημαίνει τελειότητα (but the appellation of the hypostasis of each of the forefighters indicates through deed the perfection of their own life-style). In the following it is then asserted that Eustratius ‘had battled’ (στρατευσάμενος) for God, Auxentius had ‘augmented’ (αὐξήσας) the confession, Eugenius had behaved ‘nobly’ (εὐγενῶς), Mardarius had ‘withered’ (ἐμάρανεν) the pagan belief, and Orestes had sojourned in ‘heavenly mountains’ (ὄρεσιν οὐρανίσις).<sup>135</sup> The other texts do not contain such clear evidence. Yet it is noticeable that there we encounter the rare compound θεοπάροχος.<sup>136</sup>

The *Encomium* of Daniel was composed at the request of a bishop or metropolitan, who bore the same name: ὑπακοὴν πατρὸς καὶ ἀρχιερέως Χριστοῦ

133 See EHRHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand*, I, 1 (cited n. 1), 509-512.

134 Eustratius, Codex Chalcensis 88, fol. 109v; and *Life* of Nicholas, 51, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 138.24-139.1.

135 *Encomium* of Eustratius, Chalcensis 88, fol. 104v.

136 *Encomium* of Daniel, Chalcensis 88, fol. 150v: ταπεινώσις θεοπάροχος ψυχῶν φαεινῶν, fol. 155r: ἀδικουμένων θεοπάροχοι λυτρωταί; *Encomium* of Philip, Vaticanus graecus 1669, fol. 400r: ἔγνωτε τοῦ ιδιώτου τὴν θεοπάροχον γνώσιν.

ἐκπληροῦντι τῇ σῆ προσηγορίᾳ κατακεκοσμημένου (being obedient to the father and archpriest of Christ who is adorned with your appellation).<sup>137</sup> When Michael wrote it he may already have been abbot of Dalmatos because he exclaims: φέρε καὶ ἡμεῖς ταῖς τοῦ ποιμένου ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οἱ ἄχρηστοι ποιμένες ἐρειδόμενοι προσευχαῖς τὸν περὶ τοῦ προφήτου λόγον ἀναλάβωμεν (let us, too, the useless shepherds, then take up the speech about the prophet, relying on the prayers of the shepherd).<sup>138</sup> Even more interesting is the *Encomium* of Philipp, which appears to have been delivered in the saint's cult centre of Hierapolis since it includes the two phrases ὁ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐπαρχίας δεσπότης, ὁ ἔνδοξος καὶ πανευσεβῆς Φίλιππος (the lord of our diocese, the glorious and most pious Philipp) and ὁ δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως μετὰ θεὸν σωτήρ (the saviour of our city after God).<sup>139</sup> It seems that Michael made a trip there because he states clearly that he delivered the speech personally at the request of the local metropolitan: φέρε εἰ δοκεῖ πρὸς τὸν νῦν εἰς ὑπόθεσιν ἡμῖν εὐφημιῶν προκείμενον τῷ λόγῳ συνδράμωμεν, ταῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ ποιμένου ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν θαρρήσαντες προσευχαῖς, παρ' οὗ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ὁρμὴν τοῦ λόγου κεκινήμεθα, πατρικῶς τὴν ὑπακοὴν ἀπαιτοῦντος (let us then congregate through the speech to him who is now the topic of our praises, trusting in the prayers of the sacred shepherd for us, by whom we were also moved towards the effort of the speech, who demands obedience like a father).<sup>140</sup>

It would lead too far to make comparisons between all unpublished *encomia* and their respective models. In order to give a sense of Michael's metaphrastic technique, I will only consider one text, the *Encomium* of Philipp. In the manuscript it follows a *passio* of the saint, which clearly served as *Vorlage*. The passage I have selected is a speech of Philipp to the snake-worshipping inhabitants of Hierapolis.

*Encomium* of Philip

Τί δέ; ὁ μέγας ἀπόστολος Φίλιππος, κατοικτιζόμενος αὐτῶν τὴν ἀβελτερίαν, σχετλιάζων διὰ τὴν βαθεῖαν αὐτῶν τῆς ἀπωλείας νύκτα, προτίθησιν τὰ σωτήρια φάρμακα καὶ φησίν·

Ἀδελφοί μου υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρός μου, ὑμεῖς ἐστε τοῦ γένους μου κατὰ Χριστὸν ὑπαρξίς τῆς ἐμῆς πόλεως τῆς ἄνω Ἱερου-

*Passio* of Philip

Ἐδίδαξεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς οὕτως (sc. ὁ Φίλιππος)·

Ἀδελφοί μου υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρός μου, ὑμεῖς ἐστε τοῦ γένους μου κατὰ Χριστὸν ὑπαρξίς τῆς ἐμῆς πόλεως τῆς ἄνω Ἱερου-

137 *Encomium* of Daniel, Chalcensis 88, fol. 145v.

138 *Encomium* of Daniel, Chalcensis 88, fol. 145v.

139 *Encomium* of Philip, Vaticanus graecus 1669, fol. 389v, 390r.

140 *Encomium* of Philip, Vaticanus graecus 1669, fol. 390r.

σαλήμ, ἡ τερπνότης τοῦ κατοικητηρίου μου, διὰ τί αἰχμαλωτεύθητε ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ὑμῶν ὄφως τοῦ εἰλισσομένου καὶ ὀλολόξου καὶ διεστραμμένου ὄντος, ᾧ οὐδ' ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς χεῖρας καὶ πόδας, στρεβλὴ δὲ ἡ πορεία αὐτοῦ, ἐπειδὴ υἱὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. ᾧ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας,

Ὡ τῆς τοῦ μακαρίου Φιλίππου συμπαθείας, εἶδεν αὐτοὺς μωλωπισθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ πονηροῦ ὄφως κακουργίας, καὶ ἀπαλοῖς τισὶ καὶ προσηγέσιν ἐμπλάστροις ἐκμυζῆσαι τὸν φθοροποιὸν ἰὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν κατεπείγεται.<sup>141</sup>

What then? The great apostle Philip, having mercy on their foolishness and being distressed because of their deep night of perdition, applies the salvific medicines and says:

“My brothers, sons of my father, you are of my race in Christ, possession of my city, Jerusalem on high, the pleasantness of my dwelling-place, why have you been enslaved by your foe, the snake, which is coiling and slanting throughout and twisted, to which God did not even give hands and feet, and its movement is crooked, since it is a son of the evil one.”

O the apostolic mercy, o the compassion of the blessed Philip, he saw them bruised by the wickedness of the evil snake, and hastened to squeeze out the corrupting venom of their hearts with soft and soothing plasters.

σαλήμ, ἡ τερπνότης τοῦ κατοικητηρίου μου, διὰ τί αἰχμαλωτεύθητε ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ὑμῶν ὄφως τοῦ εἰλισσομένου καὶ ὀλολόξου καὶ διεστραμμένου ὄντος, ᾧ οὐ δέδωκεν ὁ θεὸς χεῖρας καὶ πόδας, στρεβλὴ δὲ ἡ πορεία αὐτοῦ, ἐπειδὴ υἱὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ, ὅτι πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ θάνατος, ἡ δὲ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ φθορά, καὶ ὄλεθρος ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ κτλ.<sup>142</sup>

For (sc. Philip) taught them thus:

“My brothers, sons of my father, you are of my race in Christ, possession of my city, Jerusalem on high, the pleasantness of my dwelling-place, why have you been enslaved by your foe, the snake, which is coiling and slanting throughout and twisted, to which God did not even give hands and feet, and its movement is crooked, since it is a son of the evil one because his father is death and his mother is corruption and perdition is in its body etc.”

141 Vaticanus graecus 1669, fol. 396v-397r.

142 Passio of Philip 109-110, ed. R. A. LIPSIVS – M. BONNET *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, II. Leipzig 1903, 42.15-23. The Vaticanus graecus 1669, fol. 380r, has an identical text.

Comparison with the *passio* shows that Michael has elaborated the introduction to the speech considerably. By contrast, he has reproduced the content of the speech quite faithfully. He does not, however, quote it in full but concludes with a series of exclamations that has no counterpart in his model. The passage is a typical example of Michael's approach where direct speech is treated quite differently from the rest of the narrative.

### Michael the Synkellos

The *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel that we have discussed above is preserved in two manuscripts of the early tenth century, one of which was copied at the monastery of Stoudios already in Michael's life-time. There exists, however, another version, preserved in much later manuscripts, whose lemma reads: Μιχαὴλ τοῦ μακαριωτάτου συγκέλλου τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας (by Michael the most blessed *synkellos* of the holy great church of God).<sup>143</sup> Matantseva thought that this attribution was wrong and that the copyist had confused Michael with Methodius' *synkellos*.<sup>144</sup> She was not aware that there existed another holder of the office who bore this name. In 1987 Ihor Ševčenko published a funerary inscription, which had been found at the site of the monastery of Galakrenai outside the capital.<sup>145</sup>

Τύμβος ἐγὼν προλέγων βιοτήν, τρόπον, οὄνομα τοῦδε  
 Σύγκελλος Μιχαὴλ μοναχός, σοφός, ὄλβιος ὧδε  
 Ἄχθος ἀπορρίψας βεβαρήτα δεσμὸν ἀλύξας  
 Ποσσὶν ἐλαφροτάτοισι διέστιχεν, ἦχι χορεύει  
 Πιστότατος θεράπων μεγαλήτορος ἀρχιερέως  
 Νικόλεω γεγαῶς πινυτόφρονος ὅστις ἔτευξε  
 Τόνδε νεῶν ὑψίστω ἐπουρανίῳ βασιλῆϊ.<sup>146</sup>

I am the tomb that recounts life, character, name of this one: Michael the *synkellos*, monk, wise, rich here, cast off the burden, for he was uneasy with the shackles that weighed him down, and moved over, with nimble feet, to where he is dancing, having been a most trustworthy servant of the great-hearted and

143 See MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited. n. 7), 129. For the title see Parisinus Coislinianus 146, fol. 217v.

144 See MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited. n. 7), 123, n. 98.

145 I. ŠEVČENKO, *An Early-Tenth-Century Inscription from Galakrenai*. *DOP* 41 (1987) 461-463.

146 ŠEVČENKO, *Early-Tenth-Century Inscription* (cited n. 145), 461-462. Cf. 464: 'We connect "here" with "monk" rather than with burden.' I would argue that "here" refers not only to "monk" but to all three epithets.

wise archpriest, Nicholas, who had this temple built in honour of the highest heavenly ruler.<sup>147</sup>

As the last three verses reveal this Michael was *synkellos* of an ‘archpriest’ named Nicholas. As Ševčenko pointed out, this can only refer to Nicholas Mystikos who had founded the monastery of Galakrenai. Nicholas was patriarch twice, from 901 to 907 and from 912 to 925. It appears that at the time it was not yet customary to appoint more than one *synkellos* at a time.<sup>148</sup> Accordingly, a *terminus ante quem* would be the year 928/29 when Theophylact, the son of Romanus Lekapenos, was appointed *synkellos*, in preparation for his later ordination as patriarch.<sup>149</sup> It is more difficult to establish a *terminus post quem*. Euthymius who in 907 became patriarch in Nicholas’ stead had been appointed *synkellos* of Patriarch Stephen in the year 889. He may have lost this position during the tenure of Stephen’s successor Anthony Kauleas. Yet he seems to have regained it before the year 907.<sup>150</sup> This suggests that Michael served Nicholas during his second patriarchate.

This dating would accord well with what we know about the monk and archimandrite Michael. Indeed, it is possible to establish a link between the inscription and one of the texts that can be securely attributed to him. The first two verses are closely related to one another: the second supplies the information that is announced in the first. At first one might think that οὐνομα refers to Σύγκελλος Μιχαήλ. Yet when we consider the other correspondences we arrive at a different conclusion. The sequence βιοτήν τρόπον οὐνομα has the same position in the verse as μοναχός σοφός ὄλβιος, and the parallelism is further reinforced through the last words τοῦδε and ὧδε. Since βιοτήν and τρόπον correspond to μοναχός and σοφός one can argue that οὐνομα corresponds to ὄλβιος, which is in any case in its literal meaning an odd characterisation for a monk. This suggests that ‘Ol-bios’ was Michael’s surname or sobriquet. Significantly, the same adjective appears in the *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus where the author speaks about himself.

Καὶ ἐμὲ τὸν ἐλάχιστον ὑμῶν καὶ παρ’ ἀξίαν ἐγκωμιαστὴν ἐκ ποικίλων παγίδων τοῦ ἐχθροῦ καὶ τῆς ὑμῶν ἐνθέου καταξιοῦντες εὐλογίας ἴν’ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς φρουρούμενος ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ καὶ τόπῳ καὶ πράγματι ἰθυνόμενός τε καὶ φωτιζόμενος ἀξίως διατεθεῖν τῆς κλήσεως ἧς προσκέκλημαι – ὁρᾶτε τὴν δυσχέρειαν ὅση ἦσαν ποτ’

147 The translation is that of ŠEVČENKO, *Early-Tenth-Century Inscription* (cited n. 145), 462, with minor modifications.

148 See J. DARROUZÈS, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l’église Byzantine (Archives de l’Orient Chrétien, 11)*. Paris 1970, 17-19.

149 Theophylaktos *PMBZ* 28192.

150 Euthymios, *PMBZ* 21913. See also BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur* (cited n. 5), 549.

ἦσαν ὄλβιοι Μιλήσιοι,<sup>151</sup> νῦν δὲ τοῦναντίον ἅπαν – καὶ εὐοδοθεῖην κατ’ αὐτὴν λιταῖς ὑμῶν ἀγίαις εἰς τὸ εὐαρέστως θεῶ κυβερνήσαι τοὺς λογικοὺς ἄρνας.<sup>152</sup>

And to preserve me, your most humble servant and unworthy encomiast, from the various traps of the enemy and make me worthy of your divinely inspired blessing so that by it I may remain guarded and guided and illuminated in every place, time and thing, and that I may be disposed in a way that is worthy of the calling for which I have been called – Look at the trouble, how great it is! Once ay once the Milesians were rich, but now everything is the opposite – and that I may travel well according to it through your holy entreaties so as to direct your rational sheep in a God-pleasing way.<sup>153</sup>

The phrase ἦσαν ποτ’ ἦσαν ὄλβιοι Μιλήσιοι, which is at the centre of the passage, ultimately goes back to the line πάλαι κοτ’ ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι (once upon a time the Milesians were valiant) in one of Anacreon’s poems.<sup>154</sup> It became proverbial and was repeatedly quoted in Ancient literature. Eventually it found its way into the *lexica* of Hesychius and Photius where we encounter a version that is closer to Michael’s *encomium*: ἦσαν ποτ’ ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι (once ay once the Milesians were valiant).<sup>155</sup> Even so, however, there remains an important difference. In the *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus the epithet ἄλκιμοι is replaced with ὄλβιοι, a modification for which there is no parallel.<sup>156</sup> The adjective ἄλκιμος appears several times in Michael’s oeuvre.<sup>157</sup> Thus we can be certain that the change was made for a particular reason and that the adjective ὄλβιος had a specific significance. When we consider the inscription an explanation suggests itself. The phrase ἀξίως διατεθεῖην τῆς κλήσεως ἧς προσκέκλημαι might refer to ‘Olbios’ as a πρόσκλησις (sobriquet) and not just to Michael’s calling as abbot.<sup>158</sup>

151 So in the manuscript. Hatlie: ὄλβιοι μιλῖσιοι, translated as ‘the sheep were blissful’.

152 *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus, 33, ed. HATLIE (cited. n. 108), 293.8-15.

153 Hatlie’s translation, with modifications, see HATLIE, *The Encomium* (cited n. 108), 311.

154 Anacreon, *Poemata*, fr. 53 (86), ed. B. GENTILI. Rome 1958, 39.

155 See Gentili’s apparatus testimoniorum, with references to Athenaeus of Naucratis, Diodorus Siculus, and Synesius of Cyrene. See also Hesychius Alexandrinus, *Lexicon*, H 878, ed. K. LATTE, II. Copenhagen 1966, 297; and Photius Patriarcha, *Lexicon*, H 276, ed. C. THEODORIDIS, II. Berlin 1998, 277.

156 A search in the *TLG* under ὄλβ&&μιλήσ yields no results. The variant ἰσχυροί is just a gloss of ἄλκιμοι. Cf. the *scholion* to Aristophanes, *Plutus*, v. 1002: ἰσχυροί ποτ’ ἦσαν ὀ Μιλήσιοι ὡς καὶ Ἀνάκρεων φησί.

157 See e.g. *Life* of Nicholas, 50, ed. ANRICH, I (cited n. 48), 138.12-13: ὁ τῶν εἰδώλων ἀλκιμώτατος καθαιρέτης.

158 See e.g. Anastasius Traulos, *Encomium* of Agathonicus, 3, ed. G. VAN HOOFF, *Encomium* in s. Agathonicus Nicomediensem martyrem. *AnBoll* 5 (1886) 369-415, esp. 399.1: ἀγρῶ Κυβένων προσκεκλημένῳ. The ultimate model is, of course, Ephesians 4:1: Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε.



Indeed, there are parallels for such a statement in other hagiographical texts,<sup>159</sup> and Michael's interest in names and their etymology is well attested. This cannot, however, be the whole story. The proverb was clearly chosen because Μιλήσιος had a relevance for the author even before he manipulated it. Unfortunately it is no longer possible to determine what it might have signified.

### Works of Michael as Synkellos

The version of the *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel that is attributed to Michael the Synkellos differs from the version that goes under the name of Michael the Monk. This can be seen from a comparison of a passage in the edited text with its counterpart in the Codex Parisinus Coislinianus graecus 146 from the fourteenth century.

#### Text edited by Matantseva

Ἦ δυὰς ἀγγέλων θεοδημάτων προύχουσα καὶ δαιμόνων στίφη ἐλαύνουσα, ὧ ξυνωρὶς ἀγγέλων φωτοφόρος, τῆς ἀκηράτου θεαρχίας λειτουργὸς αἰδῖος καὶ τῶν ἐν περιστάσεσιν ἐξεταζομένων παναλικῆς ἐπιτάρροθος, ὧ δυὰς ἀγακλυτὸς τὰς ἀπείρους τῶν θεοειδῶν νόων ἀγελαρχοῦσα στίχας καὶ τῶν βροτῶν τὰς συνόδους φωτίζουσα, ὧ δυὰς ἀσωμάτων Μιχαὴλ καὶ Γαβριὴλ οἱ τὰς ἄνωθεν θεοπροπίας ἡμῖν διακονούμενοι καὶ σωτηρίαν λαοῖς προμηθοῦμενοι, ὧ συζυγία σεπτὴ τοῦς ὑμνητάς σου πάντας ἀπὸ ποικίλων δημεύσεων ταῖς σαῖς πρὸς θεὸν πρεσβείαις φύλαττε, τὴν λύσιν τῶν ὀφλημάτων ταῖς πρὸς θεὸν μεσιτεῖαις σου βράβευσον, ἀπὸ ἀδίκου χειρὸς ἐλευθέρωσον.<sup>160</sup>

#### Text in the Coislinianus

Ἦ δυὰς ἀγγέλων θεοδημάτων πρωτεύουσα, ὧ ξυνωρὶς ἀσωμάτων ἀστραπημόρφος, τῆς ἀπαθούς καὶ ἀγαθοδοτίδος τριάδος λειτουργὸς αἰδῖος, καὶ τῶν ἐν στάσεσιν ἐξεταζομένων πανσθενέστατος ἐπιτάρροθος, ὧ ξυνωρὶς ἀγακλυτὸς τὰς μυριάδας τῶν θειοτάτων νόων ἀγελαρχοῦσα καὶ τῶν βροτῶν τὰς συνόδους φωτίζουσα, ὧ δυὰς ἀσωμάτων Μιχαὴλ καὶ Γαβριὴλ, οἱ τὰς ἄνωθεν θεοπροπίας διακονούμενοι καὶ σωτηρίαν λαοῖς προμηθοῦμενοι, ὧ συζυγία σεπτὴ τοῦς ὑμνητάς σου πάντας ἀπὸ ποικίλων δημεύσεων ταῖς σαῖς πρὸς θεὸν πρεσβείαις διαφύλαττε, τὴν λύσιν τῶν ὀφλημάτων Χριστὸν τὸν θεὸν δωρηθῆναι ἡμῖν ἐκδυσώπησον, ἀπὸ ἀδίκου χειρὸς ἐλευθέρωσον.<sup>161</sup>

159 See e.g. *Vita A* of Athanasius the Athonite, 255, ed. J. NORET, *Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii Athonitae* (CCSG, 9). Turnhout – Leuven 1982, 124. 21, 24: τῆς σῆς παρ' ἄξίαν ἡξίωσας κλήσεως ... εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς σῆς φυτείας καὶ ὁμωνυμίας ἀξίως βιώσοιμεν.

160 *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, 13, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited n. 7), 146.3-10.

161 Parisinus Coislinianus gr. 146, fol. 230v-231r. For the manuscript see MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited n. 7), 129.

O dyad of God-wrought angels that is preminent and drives away hordes of demons, o light-bringing pair of angels, eternal minister of the undefiled principle of divinity, and valiant defender of those who are afflicted by difficulties, o exceedingly famous dyad that leads like a flock the hosts of the God-like minds, and enlightens the gatherings of the mortals, o dyad of incorporeal ones, Michael and Gabriel, who transmit to us as servants the oracles from above, and provide salvation for the peoples, o venerable couple, preserve through your intercessions with God those who praise you from manifold depredations, procure for us the freedom from our trespasses through your mediation before God, liberate from unjust hands.

O dyad of God-wrought angels that takes the first place, o lightning-shaped couple of incorporeal ones, eternal minister of the impassible triad, which dispenses the good, and most valiant defender of those who are afflicted by insurrections (?), o exceedingly famous couple that leads like a flock the myriads of the God-like minds, and enlightens the gatherings of the mortals, o dyad of the incorporeal ones, Michael and Gabriel, who transmit to us as servants the oracles from above, and provide salvation for the peoples, o venerable couple, preserve through your intercessions with God those who praise you from manifold depredations, beg that Christ, the God, gives the freedom from the trespasses, liberate from unjust hands.

These are clearly two versions of the same work. The overall structure is identical. Where different words appear in the Coislinianus they have a similar meaning, as is commonly the case in Byzantine *metaphrases*. Moreover, the version in the Coislinianus is in one instance shorter than its counterpart because the element καὶ δαιμόνων στίφη ἐλαύνουσα is missing. Other sections are abbreviated even more as can be seen from the juxtaposition of the two versions in Matantseva's article.<sup>162</sup> This does not, however, mean that the version in the Coislinianus is a mechanical *epitome*. A number of sentences are lifted from their original contexts and recombined in a different way.<sup>163</sup> Three longer passages – a comment on a feature of the liturgy,<sup>164</sup> an anti-Iconoclast invective,<sup>165</sup> and a request for help<sup>166</sup> – are also omitted. The first two are excursus, which are not directly related to the topic. By contrast, the last one forms an integral part of the text. It includes the

162 MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited n. 7), 130-131.

163 For example, *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, 8, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited n. 7), 141.9-11, comes to stand between 9, 143.38 and 10, 143.1.

164 *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, 6, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited n. 7), 139-140.40-62. See fol. 223r.

165 *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, 9-10, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited n. 7), 145-146.33-3. See fol. 231r.

166 *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel, 13, ed. MATANTSEVA (cited n. 7), 146-147.15-35. See fol. 232r.

element τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς Ναζιραίους εὐλόγησον ('bless us Nazireans'), which raises the question: was the version in the Coislinianus destined for a non-monastic audience?<sup>167</sup> If so, it would give us a clue as to why it was produced. Unfortunately, we do not know for certain. The version in the Coislinianus retains ὧ φίλοι πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί (ο beloved fathers and brothers), even though it omits the preceding καὶ ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν νηπιάζουσα φύσις (and the infantile nature according to Christ), which Matantseva took to refer to children that were being instructed in the monastery of Stoudios.<sup>168</sup> Thus it could still have been intended for a monastic audience, possibly for the community of Dalmatos.

Significantly, the *Encomium* of Michael and Gabriel is not the only text by Michael that exists in two recensions. There is also an unedited *encomium* of Zacharias, the father of the Baptist, which is preserved in two manuscripts, the Parisinus graecus 1454, dated to the tenth century, where it is attributed to Michael the Monk,<sup>169</sup> and the Parisinus graecus 1521, dated to the twelfth or thirteenth century, where it is attributed to Michael the Monk and Synkellos.<sup>170</sup> As François Halkin has indicated in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, the endings are different. This is, however, only so because the last section in the Parisinus graecus 1454 has no counterpart in the Parisinus graecus 1521.<sup>171</sup> In this section the pastoral aspect is predominant, which is unusual for an *encomium*. The listeners are told that they need to have correct faith and virtuous conduct if they wish to be saved. The warning not to acquire too much land and other property suggests that the text was delivered in front of a lay audience. It seems likely that this section was omitted in the later manuscript because it was not closely linked to the topic of the *encomium*. Through addition of a doxology the end of the praise of Zacharias was turned into a new conclusion. Comparison between the two versions is difficult because the text in the Parisinus graecus 1521 contains many corrupt words.<sup>172</sup> Even so, one can see clearly that the ver-

167 See fol. 225v.

168 MATANTSEVA, *Eloge des archanges* (cited n. 7), 115.

169 See ERHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand*, I (cited n. 1), 235: Μιχαὴλ ταπεινοῦ μοναχοῦ.

170 See ERHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand*, II (cited n. 1), 336: Μιχαὴλ μοναχοῦ συγκέλλου.

171 Parisinus graecus 1454, fol. 22v corresponds to Parisinus graecus 1521, fol. 60v. It then continues until fol. 24v.

172 Cf. e.g. Parisinus graecus 1454, fol. 18r: Προφητικαὶ χάριτες τὴν οἰκουμένην ἄνωθεν διαλαβοῦσαι, τὰς τῆς θεογνωσίας ἀκτίνας τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων διαφόρως κατεξέλαμψαν καὶ τὸ νύχος τῆς εἰδωλικῆς ἀβλεψίας ἐκ μέσου ἐποίησαν; and Parisinus graecus 1524, fol. 53r: Προφητικαὶ χάριτες τὴν οἰκουμένην ἄνωθεν διαλάμπουσαι, τὰς τῆς θεογνωσίας ἀκτείνας τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατεξέλαμψαν· καὶ τὸ μύχος τῆς εἰδωλικῆς ἀσεβείας ἐκ μέσου ἐποίησαν. Here μύχος is clearly a mistake, which suggests that the copyist did not know the rare word νύχος. Accordingly ἀσεβείας may have been the result of

sions do not differ greatly from one another. Changes are limited to the occasional replacement of synonyms. For example, Ζαχαρίας τὸ καθαρῶτατον τοῦ παρακλήτου ὄργανον (Zacharias the most pure instrument of the comforter) becomes Ζαχαρίας τὸ καθαρῶτατον τοῦ παρακλήτου παλάτιον (Zacharias the most pure palace of the comforter).<sup>173</sup>

Another text that may exist in two recensions is an *encomium* of Mary's girdle. Most manuscripts have the *incipit* τίς ὁ φαιδρὸς σύλλογος οὗτος, τίς ὁ παναρμόνιος τῆς μελωδίας φθόγγος (what is this bright gathering, what is the most harmonious sound of the melody).<sup>174</sup> Yet there exists another text, included in the Codex Athous Vatopedi 450 from the eighteenth century, which begins with the words τίς ὁ λαμπρὸς σύλλογος τῆς τῶν οὐρανοφρόνων συναθροίσεως σήμερον (what is the shining gathering of the coming together of the celestially minded today).<sup>175</sup> Unfortunately, this manuscript was not accessible to me so that I could not ascertain whether there are also differences in the remainder of the texts. Both *encomia* are attributed to Michael the Synkellos.<sup>176</sup> The oldest manuscript, the Marcianus graecus Z 360, where it appears without an author's name, has been dated to the tenth or eleventh century.<sup>177</sup> There we find the end of the text, which is missing in Combefis' edition.<sup>178</sup> The *encomium* was delivered at the church in the Chalkoprateia where the relic was kept. It includes the following passage.

Τῆ μὲν οὖν ὑπερυμνήτῳ καὶ παναγία κόρη τὴν πρέπουσαν ὕμνησιν ἤδη πρότερον ἀποδεδώκαμεν καὶ καθὼς οἰοί τε ἡμεν τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν τῆς δόξης τῆς ἀγιωσύνης αὐτῆς ἐκδιηγούμενοι τῶν αὐτῆς ἀγαθῶν ὡς ἐνῆν κατετρυφήσαμεν· μετὰ Ἄννης ἠγαλλιασάμεθα καὶ μετὰ Ἰωακείμ ἐπὶ τῆ παρ' ἐλπίδα γεννήσει τῆς θεόπαιδος εὐφράνημεν· μετὰ τῶν νεανίδων εἰς τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἄγια ταύτη συναπηρέχημεν καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Γαβριὴλ εὐηγγελισάμεθα, μετὰ πλήθους στρατιάς

---

a misunderstanding of ἀβλεψίας. Less clear is the case of διαλάμπουσαι and the *lectio difficilior* διαλαβοῦσαι, but here one could argue that Michael would not have used two compounds of λάμπειν in the same sentence.

173 Parisinus graecus 1454, fol. 21v; and Parisinus graecus 1521, fol. 59r.

174 BHG 1147.

175 BHG 1146m.

176 BHG 1147 is also attributed to Nicetas the Paplagonian, see Th. ANTONOPOULOU, Homiletic Activity in Constantinople Around 900, in M. B. CUNNINGHAM – P. ALLEN (eds.), Preacher and Audience. Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics (*A New History of the Sermon*, 1). Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998, 318-348, esp. 331, note 35: 'Dubious 127 on angels, and 1147 on the deposition of Mary's girdle (the latter two seem to be works of Michael Synkellos [d. 846]).'

177 See EHRHARD, Überlieferung und Bestand, I, 1 (cited n. 2), 432-437.

178 F. COMBEFIS, *Novum auctarium*, II. Paris 1648, 790-802.

οὐρανίου τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου γέννησιν ἐδοξολογήσαμεν· καὶ σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τεχθέντα μετὰστασιν αὐτῆς ἐωρτάσαμεν.<sup>179</sup>

We have offered the fitting praise to the exceedingly praiseworthy girl even before, and have as far as we could explained the greatness of the glory of her holiness, enjoying, as far as it was possible her good things: with Anna we have been gladdened, and with Joachim we have rejoiced at the unexpected birth of the divine child, with the young women we have accompanied her to the holy of holies, and with Gabriel we have given the good news, with the multitude of the heavenly host we have glorified the birth of the God Word from her, and with the same we have celebrated her passing over to the one who had been born from her.

This list shows that the same author delivered speeches for all Marian feasts – her birth, her presentation in the temple, the annunciation, and the dormition –, most likely also in the Chalkoprateia. That a patriarchal *synkellos* should have shouldered this task would not be surprising because the Chalkoprateia belonged to the patriarchate.<sup>180</sup> Unfortunately, the identity of the author remains uncertain. The *Encomium* of Mary's girdle contains no elements that have counterparts in texts, which can be securely attributed to Michael the Monk. One can only point out that another *encomium* for the feast was written by Michael's contemporary, the *synkellos* and later patriarch Euthymius.<sup>181</sup>

Most of Michael's texts are quite stereotypical so that it is difficult to get a sense of his personality and his preoccupations. There are, however, two exceptions, the *Encomium* of Patriarch Ignatius and the *Passio* of Callistus, one of the forty-two martyrs, which go under the name of Michael the Synkellos.<sup>182</sup> The former text postdates the death of the patriarch in 877. The title ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐγκωμίου εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Ἰγνατίου (from the encomium of the holy Ignatius) gives the impression that it is an excerpt from a longer text.<sup>183</sup> Yet the content shows that it is a short biography, devoid of all rhetorical features, which resembles the notices in the *Synaxarium* of the Church of Constantinople. This suggests that

179 Marcianus graecus Z 360, fol. 333v-334r.

180 See D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Making the most of Mary: The cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the tenth century, in L. BRUBAKER – M.B. CUNNINGHAM (eds.), *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*. Aldershot 2011, 219-246.

181 BHG 1138. See Th. ANTONOPOULOU, Ο πανηγυρικός λόγος του πατριάρχη Ευθυμίου Α' για τον απόστολο Θωμά. *Byzantina* 22 (2001) 95-112, esp. 99.

182 The text is preserved in a single manuscript, the Codex Mosquensis bibliothecae S. Synodi 162. Its title contains the author's name: συγγραφὴν παρὰ Μιχαὴλ μοναχοῦ καὶ συγκέλλου.

183 J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, XVI. Venice 1771, 292A-293E.

it is an *epitome*. Since it was written after the year 877 it would date to Michael's life-time. Yet could it also have been composed during the years when Michael was *synkellos* of Patriarch Nicholas? In the manuscripts the 'encomium' appears as part of a sequence of five pieces that are related to the controversy between Ignatius and Photius, following the *Life* of Ignatius by Nicetas the Paphlagonian and preceding the so-called *Libellus* of Theognostus, three letters by Pope Nicholas, and a letter by Epiphanius of Cyprus.<sup>184</sup> In three codices these texts precede the acts of the Fourth Council of Constantinople (869/870), which deposed Photius, and several other shorter works. In 1948 Francis Dvornik argued that all these elements were put together by a single person during the time of Pope Formosus (891-896).<sup>185</sup> Two decades later Romilly Jenkins came to a different conclusion. He asserted that Nicetas' *Life* of Ignatius dated to the first two decades of the tenth century.<sup>186</sup> More recently Irina Tamarkina has questioned the validity of Jenkins' arguments and instead sought to make the case that Nicetas wrote between 886 and 901/902.<sup>187</sup> This implies that she does not consider Dvornik's reasoning sound although she does not discuss the question in any detail.<sup>188</sup> Thus it is possible that the 'encomium' was written in the early tenth century. Indeed, it would be too much of a coincidence if there had been two *synkelloi* named Michael during the same decades, in particular since both are identified as monks. One wonders, however, why the 'encomium' should have been added to the compilation. Unlike all the other texts, it is not anti-Photian. In fact, Photius is never even mentioned. All we hear is that Ignatius was deposed at the instigation of Caesar Bardas, and later reinstated when Basil became emperor.<sup>189</sup> Since it is an *epitome* stylistic comparison with Michael's other works is impossible. Yet we can ask how it relates Nicetas's *Life* of Ignatius. It contains several features that are not found in its counterpart.<sup>190</sup> Moreover, it is noticeable that where Michael's narrative is somewhat more detailed the wording of corresponding passages is quite different.<sup>191</sup> This suggests that they are independent renderings of the same

---

184 See F. DVORNIK, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend*. Cambridge 1948, 216-217.

185 See DVORNIK, *Photian Schism* (cited n. 184), 272-275.

186 R. JENKINS, A Note on Nicetas David Paphlago and the Vita Ignatii. *DOP* 19 (1965) 241-247.

187 I. TAMARKINA, The Date of the Life of the Patriarch Ignatius Reconsidered. *BZ* 99 (2006) 615-630.

188 See TAMARKINA, *Date of the Life* (cited n. 187), 617, note 18.

189 MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum* (cited n. 183), 292E.

190 See e.g. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum* (cited n. 183), 293C, a miraculous stilling of the sea.

191 See the account of Ignatius' time as a young monk in Nicetas' *Life* and in Michael's *en-*

topic. The most striking feature of the text is the peroration, which is almost as long as the biography. It ends with the following statement.

Πῶς κατὰ τὸν μέγαν τῆς οἰκουμένης λαμπτήρα τὸν Ἀθανάσιον καὶ τοὺς κατ' αὐτὸν διδασκάλους οὐκ ἂν νῦν ἡμᾶς ἐποπτεύειν δυνήσαιο; καὶ ἡ ψήφω γὰρ θεοῦ συγκροτηθεῖσα σύνοδος πάλαι τοῦτο προεθέσπισεν οὕτω γράψασα· εἴ τις οὐκ αὐτοὺς λέγει τοὺς ἁγίους ἡμῖν ἐπιφαίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς τῶνδε, φησὶν, ἀγγέλους, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα, ἀλλ' ἐπόπτετε καὶ συντήρει ἡμᾶς.<sup>192</sup>

How should you not be able to watch us now according to the great beacon of the world, Athanasius, and the teachers like him? Also the synod that was assembled through the vote of God decreed this of old writing thus: "If someone says that it is not the saints that appear to us but their angels, he shall be anathema. However, watch and preserve us!"

The question whether the saints themselves appear in visions or whether they are impersonated by angels was hotly debated in the early tenth century. A similar statement is found in the *Encomium* of Agathonicus of Michael's contemporary Anastasios Traulos.<sup>193</sup> Since Anastasios is attested between 906/7 and 921/2 Michael could have intervened in the debate during these years.<sup>194</sup>

The *Passio* of Callistus contains the rare compound θεοπάροχος, which strengthens the case that it should also be attributed to Michael the Monk.<sup>195</sup> It is an original take on the topic. Whereas other authors speak first of the fall of Amorium, and then of the imprisonment and execution of the forty-two mar-

---

*comium*, PG 105, 496B: καρποφορεῖ ... ὑπομονὴν πρὸς πάσας αἰκίας, τοῦ καθηγεμόνος σκληροῦ τε ὄντος τὴν γνώμην, καὶ τῷ τοῖς εἰκονομάχοις χαρίζεσθαι, σκληρῶς πάνυ παιδαγωγῶντος αὐτόν, and MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum* (cited n. 183), 292D: παραδίδωσι καὶ δεινῶ ἀίρεσιάρχη καθηγεμόνι, ὃς καὶ παντοίως ἐκάκου αὐτόν, ὑπηρεσίας ἐπιτάττων βαρείας, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦννε ταύτας δι' ἀσθένειαν σώματος, μαστίζων αὐτόν ἀφειδῶς. One may even consider the possibility that Michael's text was one of the sources of Nicetas' *life*. It is not only more detailed but also part of the narrative, whereas Nicetas integrated it into a list of monastic virtues, using it as illustration for Ignatius' endurance.

192 MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum* (cited n. 183), 293D.

193 See D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Denying Mary's real presence in dreams and visions: divine impersonation in the *Life* of Constantine the Ex-Jew. *Byz* 78 (2008) 288-303.

194 See M. LAUXTERMANN, Three Biographical Notes. 3. Anastasios Quaestor. *BZ* 91 (1998) 401-405.

195 *Passio* of Callistus, ed. V. VASILIEVSKIJ – P. NIKITIN, Skazanija o 42 Amorijskih mučenikah i cerkovnaja služba im (*Zapiski Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk*, VIII, *Po istoriko-filologičeskomu Otdeleniju*, VII.2). St. Petersburg 1905, 22-36, esp. p. 35, l. 35): τοὺς ἐκ ποταμίου βυθοῦ χορηγηθέντας αὐτῷ θεοπαρόχους μαργαρίτας; without counterpart in the anonymous *Passio*, ed. VASILIEVSKIJ – NIKITIN, 21.25: καθάπερ μαργαρίτας τινὰς πολυτίμους.

tyrs Michael begins by offering a biography of Callistus, which culminates in his capture by the Arabs.<sup>196</sup> From the text it is clear that Callistus is intended to be a model for pious laymen.<sup>197</sup> The second section has counterparts in other texts about the same theme. Comparison with an anonymous *passio* shows that even the wording can be similar.

Michael's Passio (Γ)

Ἐτίλλεν αὐτοῦ τὰς ὀσίας πολιὰς ἀνηλεῶς, ἄλλοι δὲ πυγμαῖς τὰς παρεῖας αὐτοῦ συνέθλων καὶ ἕτεροι λακτισμοῖς ἐφαλλόμενοι κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ κατηκίζοντο. ὁ δὲ τύραννος, πόρωθεν βλέπων ταῦτα γινόμενα εἰς αὐτόν, ἐπυνθάνετο τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἐπήγαγεν αὐτῷ τὰς θλίψεις ταύτας.<sup>198</sup>

He pulled his venerable grey hair without mercy, others broke his cheeks with fisticuffs and others jumped on his whole body with their heels and tortured his whole body, but the tyrant who saw from afar what was happening to him, asked for the reason why they inflicted on him such hardships.

Anonymous Passio (B)

Καὶ λαβόμενοι τῶν τριχῶν ἔτιλλον ἀνηλεῶς τε καὶ ἀφειδῶς, οἱ μὲν πῦξ κατὰ γνάθων μαστίζοντες, οἱ δὲ λάξ τοῖς ποσὶν ἐπεμβαίνοντες, ὥστε ἐν ἀκαρεῖ καὶ ῥοπή ὀφθαλμοῦ ἄτριχα γενέσθαι τὸν ἅγιον καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὥσπερ ἐν χρωῖ κεκαρμένην ἀποφανθῆναι. ὁ δὲ μιαρὸς ἀλάστωρ ἐφ' οὗ βέβηκε λέμβου καθήμενος τοῦτο κατιδὼν καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἀμφιγνοῶν τοῦ ποιουμένου, ἀνακράξας μέγα καὶ καταπλήξεως πλήρης, τί τὸ γεγονός εἶη διεπυνθάνετο.<sup>199</sup>

And having grabbed his hair they pulled it out without mercy or restraint, the ones hitting him with fists on the chin, and the others attacking him with the heels of the feet, so that in no time and in the blink of an eye the saint became hairless and his head was shown to be shorn to the skin. But the polluted evildoer, sitting in the boat on which he had stepped, saw this, and wondering about the reason of what was going on, he shouted out loud and full of astonishment, asking what was happening.

196 See A. KAZHDAN, Hagiographical Notes, 14: collective death and individual deeds. *Byz* 56 (1986) 150-160, where the early tenth century is furthermore suggested as a date.

197 See D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Chastity or Procreation? Models of Sanctity for Byzantine Laymen During the Iconoclastic and post-Iconoclastic Period. *Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture* 7 (2013) 49-68.

198 *Passio* of Callistus, ed. VASILIEVSKIJ – NIKITIN (cited n. 195), 32.17-22.

199 Anonymous *Passio* of the Forty-Two martyrs, ed. VASILIEVSKIJ – NIKITIN (cited n. 195), 15.24-32.



The two passages have the element ἔτιλλεν/ἔτιλλον ἀνηλεῶς in common, which shows clearly that they are related to one another. At the same time, however, one notes clear differences. The anonymous *passio* is written in a much higher style. There we find the rare Homeric adverbs πύξ and λάξ whereas Michael's text has the more pedestrian nouns πυγμαῖς and λακτισμοῖς. It is evident that the words πύξ and λάξ were chosen because they closely resemble each other. Moreover, the parallel cola οἱ μὲν πύξ κατὰ γνάθων μαστίζοντες and οἱ δὲ λάξ τοῖς ποσὶν ἐπεμβαίνοντες have each eleven syllables and show the same pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables. The neatness of expression suggests that the anonymous *passio* reflects the original version and that Michael's text is a paraphrase in a somewhat lower style. It is also somewhat shortened: the word play ἐν ἀκαρεῖ ... ἄτριχα - ἐν χρῶ κεκαρμένην is omitted. Such a scenario would not be surprising. As we have seen Michael also produced simplified and abbreviated *metaphrases* of other texts. Since he reworked his own writings one might even consider the possibility that the anonymous *passio* was also written by him.

### Conclusion

Building on earlier research by Anrich, von Dobschütz, van de Vorst, Grégoire, Matantseva and Ševčenko, this article has sought to establish whether twelve hagiographical texts were written by the same author, the monk Michael. Positive proof has been possible for *Vita B* of Theodore and *encomia* of Michael and Gabriel and of the Apostle Philip, which are preserved in the Codex Vaticanus graecus 1669, for the *Life* of Nicholas of Myra and the *encomia* of the prophet Daniel and the three youths and of the martyr Eustratius and his companions, which are found in the Codex Chalcensis 88, and also for the *Encomium* of Isaac and Dalmatus. Less certain but still probable is Michael's authorship of the *Passio* of Callistus and of the *encomia* of Zacharias, of Patriarch Ignatius and of Mary's girdle. The greatest difficulties are posed by two anonymous works, the *lives* of Nicholas of Stoudios and of Blaise of Amorium. Because of its similarity to *Vita B* the former text may well have been written by Michael. By contrast, the latter text displays not only marked similarities but also striking discrepancies, which makes attribution less likely. Comparative analysis is not always easy since several of the works are *metaphrases* of older texts. This means that Michael's manner of writing can be influenced by the style of the authors of his *Vorlagen*, which he sometimes simplifies and sometimes elaborates. Of special interest is the fact that Michael reworked some of his own texts. From the lemmata we can conclude that he was monk of Stoudios, archimandrite of Dalmatos and *synkellos* of Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos. Yet it is not easy to reconstruct his biography.

It seems very likely that he started his monastic career at Stoudios. In *Vita B* of Theodore he claims that Nicholas of Stoudios lived until his time. This suggests that he was born before 868, the date of Nicholas' death. If we accept that Michael also wrote the *Life* of Nicholas we can add a further detail. There he tells us that he was tonsured by the abbot Anatolius who is first attested in this function in 886. Since Anatolius was the third successor of Nicholas he will not have become abbot before the middle of the 870s. This means that Michael was not yet a monk when Nicholas died. Accordingly, he was most likely born around the year 860. We know nothing about Michael's time as archimandrite of Dalmatos, yet it seems likely that he transferred there directly from Stoudios. By contrast, we can be relatively certain that Michael was *synkellos* between 912 and 925. Since the monastery of Dalmatos had close links with the patriarchate it is possible that Michael became archimandrite only then. Yet the *Life* of Nicholas of Stoudios suggests that even at that point he was closely associated with Stoudios and its abbot, Anatolius. He may have died before 925 since he was buried in Nicholas Mystikos' monastic foundation, Galakrenai, although it is, of course, impossible to be certain. It is to be hoped that all his *encomia* will be edited in the near future. Only then will it be possible to get a clear sense of the scope and quality of Michael's hagiographical oeuvre.

University of Vienna  
Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies

#### ABSTRACT

This article seeks to reconstruct the hagiographical oeuvre of a little known Byzantine author, through analysis of texts that in the manuscripts are attributed to 'Michael the Monk', 'Michael the Archimandrite' and 'Michael the Synkellos' and of other anonymous writings that display similar stylistic features. It makes the case that Michael lived in the second half of the ninth and the first half of the tenth century and was monk of Stoudios, archimandrite of Dalmatos, and *synkellos* of Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos.